

AN  
ANSWER TO THE  
CHALLENGE

Of Mr. *Henry Jennings* (Protestant Arch-deacon of Dromore) which evidently makes out the present Church of Romes doctrine to have been maintain'd in the first five ages, & the adversariys Principles to be only a heap of heresies lawfully condemn'd by the primitive Church.

*To which is annexed An Answer to one Whealy.* †

Set forth by JAMES O SHIELL  
Reader of Divinity.

*Remember the dayes of old, consider the years of many generations, aske thy Father, & he will shew thee, thy elders, & they will tell thee. Deut c. 32. v. 7.*

Permissu Superiorum. 1699.

1855





TO THE  
QUEEN  
MADAM,

**T**His little book makes bold to  
adress it self to your Sacred  
Majestie, not to inform or in-  
struct you in any thing it con-  
taines, for beside the gifts of na-  
ture and great perfections, with  
which your Majestie is so richly  
indowed; you had the advātage  
of being born & bred in the most  
Catholick Country of Europe,  
& beig well educated & throwly  
instructed in vertue, piety, religiō  
& in all other things, proper for  
so great a Princess to learn. The  
end and scope of this small trea-

tise is Madam; first to answer a  
Challège made to all Catholicks  
in General, by one of the most da-  
reing, & most presumptuous of  
the protestat party; next to pre-  
vent unwary, and well meaning  
Christians from being seduc'd,  
or impos'd upon by such artifices;  
which it will effect by Gods help;  
so it be but countenanc'd by your  
Sacred Majestie; If you consider  
only its style & contexture, or the  
Author that compos'd it, it cannot  
on either of these accounts de-  
serve this honour: but the Doct-  
rine it comprehends, being com-  
piled & faithfully extracted out  
of the scripture, holy Fathers, &  
Ancient Councils, it may on that  
score, well pretend the patronage  
& protection of so great a Queen;

Queen descended from the Glorious House of Est, which has furnish'd Europe for many hundreds of years, with Illustrious Dukes & Princes, Famous Generals, great States-men & most Eminent prelates, & Church-men; & yet never did oblige it more, than in giving it so great a Princess, so fit a consort for our Gracious King, whose piety & zeal are without example, who for his religion only, has lost the Imperial crown of three Kingdoms, & for his great resignation, & Christian patience, will infallibly receive a crown of everlasting Glory; your Majestyes Heroycal & stedfast resolution of still preferring religion before all Temporal interest, and your great zeal for the ser-

vice of God & the Catholick cause  
do evidently prove that no other  
Princes, but yourself, could be  
so agreeable to his Majestie; & so  
conformable to his generous in-  
clinations in this particular, as  
well as in all other Royal perfec-  
tions. The King, & your Majes-  
ties chief study is to maintaine & sup-  
port that religion for which both  
have sacrific'd your all; & your  
daily businesse is to comfort the  
poor, to cloath the naked, & to  
feed the hungry, to provide for  
the Fatherless & widows, & to  
supply all their wants, even to the  
straitning of yourselves; & in a  
word to promote in others by  
your own example the practice of  
all the workes of piety, & Charity  
imaginable. Now since standing-  
up

up in defence of truth & endeavouring to instruct the ignorant in matters of salvation, has ever been accounted a work of Charity, this little book, (how ever meanly writen) may deserve your Majestie's Royal protection & approbation, this will render it more acceptable to all good Christians, & supply it's want wherever it is defective either in language or composition; for this reason Madam, the Author does most humbly presume to lay it at your Majesties feet, & to beg you wou'd be Graciously pleas'd not only to afford it the honour of your Royal patronage; but also to accept of it, as a small testimony of the fidelity, & greatfull respect, justly due from all his country;

Country, where with he is ob-  
lig'd daily to pray for your  
Majestie, & ever to continue.

MADAM,

Your Majesties

*Most obedient, and most Loyal  
and most Humble Subject, and  
Servant.*

JAMES O SHIELL

(1)

*An Answer to Mr. Jennings  
Challenge.*

**A**Ltho' this Treatise be but  
small, yet it treats not of  
small matters, the subject of it  
being of no less consequence than  
the salvation of those christians,  
who are led astray from the true  
faith, because they are not guid-  
ed by any christian motive or  
Authority, but rather by their  
own wordly interest, and liberti-  
nism; which now a day too many  
preferre before gods cause and  
the salvation of their own souls,  
notwithstanding all the convinc-  
ing arguments both of our an-  
cient and modern controvertists,  
who with a great deal of pains

A

have

have shifted the wheat from the  
tares, and inspite of all oppositiō,  
have made out very clearly the  
reall and naked truth of their  
assertions in all controverted  
points between our pretended  
reformers & the present church  
of Rome; for which reason I  
wou'd at present forbear writ-  
ing of a subject so often scann'd  
and discuss'd before, but that  
I was over perswaded at the ear-  
nest request of a certin person of  
quality, who faithfully promis'd  
to be come a Roman catholick,  
if she cu'd get but a satisfactory  
answer to an extravagant bold  
challenge of one that stiles him-  
self a prelat of the church of  
England, now residing in the  
north



north of Ireland, where he makes  
a great figure, and wou'd faine,  
perswade the ignorant and vn-  
wary to belive that his notions  
are truely catholick. To prevent  
wdich impolture, and in hopes  
that some copyes of this little  
work may for the good of souls  
passe over the seas to that af-  
flicted country, where books of  
controversy are very scarce. I  
made it my business to get it prin-  
ted, having compos'd it as succinct  
and compendious as the subject  
cou'd possibly permit that it may-  
be no burden in a mans pocket.  
If the reader be not of the chutch  
of Rome, I do advite him to per-  
use it with a serious consideratiō  
and remorse of conscience, which  
if

if he does, perhaps it may be an occasion of leading him to the true light, and way of salvation, whatever he may carp vpon the method or language; I shall bear it patiētly if he does but observe and consider the meaning, and doctrine thereof. But before I proceed further, I must take notice of this daring champions legerdemain, who being sensible ~~of~~ of his own want of proofs, and authoritys to make out any one point now controverted, he wou'd faine turn the scale & impose upon the Roman catholicks to prove their assertions; whereas it is plain that since he owns the church of Rome to have been in a legal possession

*Jennings challenge* 3

possession of the true faith for  
above 300 years, after christ, he  
ought consequently to suppose that  
she kept the same faith all along,  
unless he can prove the contrary:  
yet this is no peculiar device of  
our bold challenger, but rather  
the ordinary practice of all pretē-  
ded reformers, who finding no  
solid grounds for their new no-  
tions are forc'd to trust wholly to  
negatives, and endeavor upon  
that account to impose the proof  
upon the lawfull possessors; but  
among all methinks it seems very  
unfair for any that stiles himself  
of the church of England, to de-  
ny this principle of lawfull pos-  
session, since their own best wri-  
ters do much insist upon it to  
make

make out their right against those sectaries, who like new swarms separated from the stock. As the Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Quakers, sofinians &c. But to come to the present point let us see the arrogant challenge of this proud Goliath, which runs to this purpose.

Whosoever is desirous to find and embrace a church where the old incorrupted principles of christianity are taught, & such doctrines only as were maintain'd by the ancient and pure church even of Rome for upward of 300 years after christ, let him embrace the present church of England, where the said principles are duely profess'd the old church

church of Rome and the present church of England, being the same in principles; whereas the doctrines which the present church of Rome has added over and above what the church of England, maintains, & wherein the said churches do now differ, were never maintain'd by the said ancient church of Rome, but newly brought-in, some eight or nine hundred years, others seven & the most of the 600 years after christ. In justification of which charge we alwayes have and still do bid defiance to any Roman catholick living to bring any sufficient sentence out of any old doctor or father, or out of any old council, or out of the holy scripture

scriptures or any one example of the primitive church whereby it may be clearly, and plainly prov'd.

- 1 That there was any private masse in the whole world at that time for the space of six hundred years after christ.
- 2 That the communion was administered unto the people under one kind.
- 3 That the people then had their common prayes in a tongue, which they understood not.
- 4 That the bishop of Rome was then call'd the universal bishop, or the head of the universal church.
5. That then the people were taught to believe that christ's body  
is

is really or substantially in the sacrament.

6. That then the people did fall down, and worship it with godly honour.

7. That in the sacrament after the words of consecration there remain only the accidents & shew, without the substance of bread and wine.

8. That whosoever had then said the sacrament is only but a figure, a pledge, a token, or remembrance of christ's body, had therefore been judg'd for an heretic.

9. That images were then set up in churches to the intent that the people might worship them.

10. That then the people did invoke

vocate saints, or pray to them.

11. That then the people believ'd that there is a third place, which commonly the Papists call purgatory.

12 That then the people were forbiddē to read the word of god in their own tongue.

If these thigs be as we alleage, it follows that whosoever maintaīn the aforſaid abus'd principles, are not of the āciēt church of Rome but only of the presēt corrupted church of Rome & if our allegatiōs be false, we desire to be disprov'd.

Before I come to any particular answer to the severall points of this extravagant challenge, which the mans ignorance or vanity makes him belive unanswerable. I will only thus in gene-



ral retort his own argument upon himself, that J may form, his discourse, in the true and right method.

Whosoever desires to find and embrace a church wherein the old incorrupted principles of christi-  
āity are taught and such doctrines only as were maintain'd by the ancient and pure church even of Rome for upwards of 300 years after christ, let him embrace the present church of Rome, wherein the said principles are duely profess'd, the old and the present church of Rome being still the same in principles, whereas the doctrines of those who now call themselves the church of England, and wherein the said church

churches do now differ, were never maintain'd by the a<sup>n</sup>ci<sup>e</sup>t church of Rome, but rather impiously brought in by a series of hereticks, who for those very doctrines were from time to time cōdemn'd by many general, national, and provincial councils and also by the most eminent fathers and doctors of the catholick church in those respective ages; whose authorityes, and very words. I will hereafter produce in my answer to the several points here controverted, that every impartial reader may see how all the aspersions, and calumnies rais'd by our pretended reformers against the church of Rome, are but meer fictions without

*Jennings challenge.* 13

out any tolerable ground, reason or authority.

In the mean time I think it is very plain that my retortion ought to take place before my adversaries precarious sort of discourse, and consequently that such a challenge belongs properly to the church of Rome, and not to any upstart sectary whatsoever, for as I hinted before, it is a principle in all well govern'd common-wealths that a peaceable possessor ought not to be disturb'd untill by manifest proof he is convicted to be an unlawfull possessor: but the church of Rome which undenyably was a peaceable possessor of the true faith for the first 300 or as my adversary is

is willing to allow, for six hundred years after christ was never convicted by any competent authority or proof, that ever she fell from the true faith of Jesus christ: therefore it necessarily follows that shee must be still suppos'd to retain the same true faith to this very day. The major is manifest, and a maxim in law, and the minor I prove thus. If the church of Rome could at anytime be juridically condemn'd, or declar'd to have fallen from the true faith, it must have been either by some immediate revelation or commission from God, as the written law was abrogated to make Place for the law of grace, and as the high priest

*Ienning challenge.*

15

Priesthood was transfer'd from the house of Heli, to an other family, or by some other Church call'd and summon'd by the inspiration of the holy Ghost, in some National, or general Council, as the Arians, Macedonians, Nestorians, Pelagians, Eutychians, and many other Heresies were condemn'd in former times, but neither of those can be alleag'd in the case propos'd, the first is not so much as pretended, nor can the later be alleag'd by any man in his wits; for no National, or General Council, no, nor any old Chronicles, Registers, Ecclesiastical, or prophane Histories, makes mention that ever the Roman Church fell from the true faith:

so that if we except the inconsiderable dregs of cōdemn'd Heresies, which lay hid in obscure corners of the earth, there was no Church, or society of Christians extant in the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, &c. Centuries, but were all in communion with the Church of Rome, in their respective ages: & all the eminent Doctors & Fathers of those times, seriously exposed her cause as the cause of Christ: wherefore either the Church of Rome, kept the true faith inviolably all that while, or Christ had no true Church upon earth: which is plainly giving the lye (not only) to the Angel Gabriel, who declared that of Christs Kingdom which is his Church, ther should be no end. Luke chap. the 1. v.

but also to Christ himself, who expressly promis'd, that the Gates of Hell shou'd not prevaile against his Church. Math. chap. the 16. v. 18. and that he wou'd be with his disciples in the administration of their function, even to the end of the world. Math. chap 28. v. the 20.

For a further confirmation of this point, it is evident, that no Church, or society of Christians, can shew their lineal, and lawfull succession of pastors, and Bishops, ever since the Apostles time, but the present Church of Rome, and such as are in communion with her; for those that now stile themselves, the Church of England, cannot for their lives shew

any before Cranmer, in Edward the sixth time; as appears by Goodman, the Protestant Bishop of Hereford, in his Catalogue of all the Bishops of England since the first plātatiō of Christiā religiō amongst them, where he expressly names, Thomas Cranmer to be the first protestant Bishop, that was ever seen in England. Upon the whole matter, since none but the presēt Romā Catholik Church can pretend to have had since the Apostles time, a continued series of Bishops, with whom all their cōtemporaries of the orthodox part of Christians alwayes agreed in one faith and communion, it plainly follows that she alone can pretend to the purity of



ard the Christian faith. And there-  
by fore, whoſoevèr deſires to find,  
hope and embrace a Church, wherein  
e the old incorrupted principles of  
nc Chriſtianity are taught, and ſuch  
igi principles only as were main-  
reſ tain'd, by the Ancient and pure  
o b Church of Rome, for upwards of  
tha 300. years after Chriſt, let him em-  
pon brace the preſent Church of  
but Rome, wherein the ſaid principles  
rch are duely profeſſ'd; as I ſhall  
nce manifeſtly prove in my Answer  
l ſe to the aſorſaid points: for be-  
all ing the ancient Father St. Baſile  
tho in his 63. Epistle, declares unto  
aye us. *That we ought not to paſſe yver*  
mu calumnyes; not out of revenge but leſt  
she we ſh<sup>d</sup> ſeem to give way to a lye,  
ty or ſuffer men ſeduc'd to be further de-

Bj

cev'd

I shall (therefore) answer my Adversary's challenge, in the same order that he has laid it, chap. 1. Proving both publick, and privat Masses, to have been celebrated in the premitive Church.

This Challenger, seems to lay his main stress, upon the word privat Masse, but what he means by it, he does not explain: tis certain, that altho' Masses were said privately in all ages, especially during the persecution of the Heathens. when Christians perform'd their Devotions, in caves, and vaults, under ground; yet the word privat masse, was seldom us'd by Catholick writers, either before, or since the year 600. until Martin Luther by his book de-  
Missa

ny  
ne  
1.  
at  
ed  
his  
at  
it,  
in,  
ri-  
ur-  
ea-  
n'd  
nd  
the  
om  
her  
ntil  
de-  
iffa

Missa privata, oblig'd Catholick  
Divines, to write upon that sub-  
ject, and confute to the full Lu-  
thers arguments against it, but  
why is the question rais'd about  
private masse? does my adversary  
own that publick Masses were in  
use, in the primitive church? If so,  
he must either quitt the old, as  
well as the present Church of  
Rome, or condemn his own  
Church of England, which de-  
clares against all masses, both pri-  
vat & publick; and indeed who-  
soever admits one, can have no  
tolerable reason to deny the o-  
ther, contrary to the practice of  
so many ages. But let him deny  
or own what he pleases, tis evident  
to us by the undeniable testi-

monyes of several Fathers, and Councils, more ancient than the year 600, that both publick, and privat masses, were then in use in the Catholick Church, and offer'd to the Almighty, both for the living, and the dead, as occasion requir'd. St. James the Apostle, speaking to Almighty God in his liturgy sayes: *we offer unto thee an anbloody sacrifice for our sins, and for the ignorance of the people.* And St. Andrew likewise said, (as the Priests and Déacons of Achia in the book they writt of this Apostles passion) *I sacrifice daily unto Almighty God, an immaculate lamb . . . who, when he' is truly sacrific'd, and his flesh truly eaten, remains still wholly and alive.* St. Irenæus, who liv'd the

the year 180 in his 4. book against heresies, c: 32: after speaking of the sacrifices which were offer'd in the old law: sayes, *that our Lord taught the Apostles to offer anew sacrifice, which, the Church afterwards being taught by the Apostles, offer'd through the universal world.* St. Cyprian, who liv'd the year 250. prohibit'd to offer any sacrifice for the soul of Geminus Faustus, because he did not observe the decree of his own antecessors, the Bishops. Cornelius Bishop of Rome, who liv'd about the year 254. complains, that the persecution was so great in his own time, that they cou'd not say masses, either in publick Churches, or in Caves under ground, which Authority may be seen, Tomo. 1. Biblia

*Biblia Sanctorum Patrum. Tertullian*, who liv'd in the same century sayes: in his book *de corona militis*, c. 3. that masses were then offer'd for the souls of the dead. and *Eusebius Cesariensis*, who liv'd the year 326, relates in his 4. book c. 45. that there were masses said for the soul of *Constantine* the Great. *St. Cy-rill* of Jerusalem who liv'd in the same century, *Catech.* 5. sayes thus: we believe that the holy, and dreadfull sacrifice, which is offer'd upon the altar, is a great relief to those for whom its offer'd, so *Zomenus* relates in his 7. book c. 5. that *St. Gregory Nazianzen* said Masse in a private chappel, and *Paulinus* (writing the life of *St. Ambrose*) affirms that

er- St. Ambrose said Masse in a certai  
me Gentel womans house; & St. Am-  
ro- brose himself, in his commentary  
hen on the 38: Psal.) bids the Priests,  
nd to offer this holy sacrifice for o-  
'd thers. *Theodoret* (who liv'd the  
4. year 430. in his History c. 20.) de-  
es clares, himself to have said masse,  
he in a Hermits cell; and St: Gre-  
m gorie (in his 37. Homily) affirms  
y, that the holy Bishop. Cassius was  
ve wont to say masse, in his oratory,  
i- being hinder'd from going to the  
r, church, by reason of his infir-  
s mity: St. *Hierome* (who liv'd the  
s year 390. in his Commentary on  
- the 11. chap of the proverbs) sayes  
t the following words: *Its to be Ob-*  
serv'd, that altho' there is no hopes of  
pardon,

*pardon for the wicked, after their death, yet there are those who dye vith small sins, and after their death, can be discharg'd, either by chastising them with punishments, or by their friends prayers, alms, and celebration of masses.* In his commentary on St. Pauls Epist: to Titus, he sayes thus *If the Laity are commanded to abstaine from their wives in the time of communion, what is to be suppos'd of the Bishop: who daily for his own, and the peoples sins, offers to God the undefiled sacrifice; he hath such an other Authority, in his first book against Jovinian, c. 19. speaking of the priests. St. Chrysostome who liv'd in the later end of the 4. century in his 3. homily on St. Pauls Epist, to the Philippians, speaking of those,*



those who dye in the fear of God) sayes thus: *It was not in vain the Apostles order'd that they shou'd be remember'd in the venerable, and terrible mysteries, for they knew this to be a relief, and help to them for when all the people with open arms, and the priests offer that dreadfull sacrifice, full of veneration, how shall we not pacifie God, praying for them; he hath such an other Authority in his 41. Homily, on St. Pauls first Epist: to the Corinthians, and in his 7. Homily on his Epist: to the Hebrews, he sayes thus, speaking of Christ, we offer alwayes the same, truly noe other, but still the same, therefore it is one sacrifice for this reason; because he is offer'd in several places. are they many Christs; no, not at all, but*

*one Christ, in all places, who is whole and intirely, here, and there, one body* in his 32. *de Consubstantiali* b. Sharply reprehend, those who neglect to hear masse, and in his 2. Homily (*de baptismo,*) he compares those, (who leave masse before the last benediction) to Judas, who at the Lords last supper, departed before giving, thanks, More of his Authorityes may be seen, not only in his liturgy, but (also) in several places; manifestly proving, the ancient practice of celebrating masses: St. Augustin (who liv'd in the begining of the 5. century) declares (in his 9. book of Confession c. 12. that there was masse said for the soul of his own Mother Monica, her body being laid beside

*sepulchre.* In his 32 Ser: de verbis  
Apostoli, speaking of the dead, he  
sayes the following words: *the*  
*prayers of the holy church, the comfortable*  
*sacrifice, and the alms, which are offer'd*  
*for those spirits, is not to be doubted,*  
*that they are help'd by them----* for  
*this has been deliver'd by the Fa-*  
*thers, which now the universal Church*  
*observes; that those whodye, in the com-*  
*munion of the body, & blood of Christ)*  
*are remembr'd, when the sacri-*  
*fice is offer'd ---- who doubts them*  
*to be favour'd; for prayers are not in*  
*vain offer'd for them to God. And in*  
*his Enchiridion c. 110. he (also)*  
*sayes: that it is not to be deny'd, that*  
*the soul of the dead are eas'd, when*  
*the holy sacrifice is offer'd for them.*  
In his 22. book of the city of God,  
chap.

chap. 8. he relates, that when Hesperious's country house was trou-  
 bl'd, by malignant spirits; that  
 he desir'd one of his priests, to go  
 thither, by the vertue of whose  
 prayers, the spirits might give o-  
 ver: one of them went (saith he)  
 and offer'd there, the sacrifice of  
 the body of Christ - - - and after-  
 wards the House, was no more  
 troubl'd. More of St. Augustin's  
 Authorities may be seen, in his  
 46. Epist. in his book de cura pro-  
 mortuis: c. 18. in his book de  
 sancta virgin: c. 45. in his first  
 book de origine animæ c. 9. 11: &  
 in his 84. treatise in Joānem. All  
 which I omit to produce for bre-  
 vity sake; & shall only insert, that of  
 venerable Bede, who in his first  
 book

book c: 29 relates. that St. Gregory had sent Priestly ornaments to St. Augustin, the apostle of England, and in his 4 book c: 12 he tells, that when Jmma was taken captive by the enemyes that he cou'd never bery'd by reason of several masses, which his brother Tunna the monke said for his soul; believing that he was kill'd in the battel and also in his 5 book c. 13. speaking of that terrible vision of Driethelme, who after his death reviu'd and told wonderfull things concerning the pains of purgatory from which (said venerable Bede) Prayers, alms, fasts, and celebrations of masses doe release many before the day of Judgment.

Now let us see the councils Authorities, It was decree'd in the 5 can: of the council of Vafens (a towne in France where 18 Bishops gather'd the year 442) that kyrie eleison (shu'd be said in the masses throughout all the Churches of France; as it was said long before in the East and in all Italy, here are the councils very words: *quia tam in sede apostolica, quam etiam per totas Orientis atque Italia provincias dulcis, et nimis salubris consuetudo in promissa est, ut kirieeleison cum grandi affectu, accompnctione dicatur, placuit etiam ut in omnibus Ecclesiis vestris ista consuetudo sancta, et ad matutinum, et ad missas, et ad vesperam deo propitiante intromittatur.* Likewise it was enacted in the 6 can of.

of the same council that the following words, holy, holy, holy, shu'd be said ī mornig masses, ī the masses of lent and in those masses which were offer'd for the dead, as it was accustom'd to be said in solemn Masses the words of the Council are these: *In omnibus missis, five matutinis, five quadragessimalibus five in illisque pro defunctorum commemorationibus sunt semper sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, eo ordine quo ad missas publicas dici debeat, quia tam dulcis, et desiderabilis vox etiam die noctuque possit dici fastidium non potest generare, et hoc nobis justum visum est ut nomen Domini Papæ quicunque sedi apostolicæ præfuerit in nostris Ecclesiis recitetur.* Which Authorityes doe not only make out the ancient practice of celebrating Masses, but also

the Popes supremacy of which I shall treat in my answer to the 4 point. In the mean time let us hear the Declarations of other old Councils concerning the present point. We read in the 18 can. of the council of Agato celebra- ted the year 506 that the seculars were then oblig'd to receive the Communiõ trice in the year (viz) at Christemas, Easter and Whit- suntide, and in the 47 can. of the same coũcil tis expres'd that they were oblig'd to hear masse every Sunday. Which plainly makes- out, that in the primitive Church it was lawfull for the Priest to say masse tho' none else wou'd recei- ve the Communion along with him; to confirm which I shall pro- duce



duce the Authorities of the two following Councils, who sate above a thousand years agoe the fathers of the 12 council of Toledo can: 5, sharply reprehend'd certain Priests for not receiving the Communion when they said Masses; which is a sign, that they acknowledg'd the Masse to be lawfull tho' none wou'd communicate, but onely the Priest. And the council of Nant c: 30 (quoted by *Ivo* p: 3 decr: e 70) prohibit'd the Priests to say masse alone without the assistance of one to answer them, which Authority proves the ancient practise of celebrating privat masses, Tho' Luther and his doctrine aleadges the contrary) for the fathers of that

Council only obliges the Priests to have clerks to answer them, but mentions not a word of a second person to be requisite for receiving the communion along with the Priest, for they knew too well that there was no divine, or Ecclesiastical precept obliging the Priest not to say Masse, if none else wou'd communicate along with him; and moreover, that there was no Precept commanding others to receive the Communion as often as the Priest wou'd celebrat Masse, (for that was left to the peoples owne Devotion) but in the time of the aforesaid solemnities specifi'd by the council of Agatho: all which may be confirm'd, by St. Chrysostomes words

words, who in his 3. Homily on Saint Pauls Epistle to the Ephesians, complains, that then the people were so undevout, that tho' there was Masse daily celebrat'd yet none of them Communicated. There are several other Authorityes, that might be produc'd, for the further proof of this point, but to avoide tediousnesse, I will conclude with the following passage. 'Tis ~~not~~ pertinent to the Essence of a sacrifice, the standers by or those for whom 'tis offer'd to be partakers of it: but Masse is a Sacrifice: therefore 'tis ~~not~~ pertinent to the essence of Masse the standers by, or those for whom it's offer'd to be partakers of it.

The major is evident out of the 6. & 7. chap. of *Leviticus*, where we read that the Priests of the old law were commanded to offer Sacrifices & that the standers by or any of those for whom they were offer'd did not take the least particle of them; the minor also is evident, out of the 9<sup>th</sup> canon of the Apostles; and out of the 24 chap: of the 3 Council of Carthage, who sate in the year 397: and declar'd masse to be a lawfull sacrifice; as for the consequence tis undeniable, being the argument is in forme:

*Chap. 2 Proving that the Communion was administred under one kind in the Primitive Church.*

The Authorityes which my adversary

versary defies to be produc'd, doe clearly make-out the ancient practice of Receiving the Communion under one sole species in the Primitive Church: therefore this doctrine was not first brought in by the present Church of Rome, either in the 6, 7, 8, or 9 age; the consequens is manifest, as will appear hereafter. As for the antecedent, it may be prov'd, by the example of Christ himselfe, *Luck c. 24 v: 30. 35* where we read the following words. *It came to passe as he sate at meat with them, he tooke bread & blæss'd it & brake, & gave to them. And they told what things were done in the way, & how he was known by them in breakīg of bread.* But there is no mention made of the cup:

no, not in the whole Chapter  
 & St. Hierome in Paula's epitaph  
 St. Augustin in his 3 book  
 consensu Evangelistarum c: 2  
 venerable Bede, Théophilactus  
 and several others in the com-  
 mentary of this chapter, do  
 plainly affirme, that our saviour  
 gave then the blessed sacrement  
 to those two disciples: moreover  
 we read in the acts of the Apostles  
 [c: 2 v: 42] that the believers  
*Continued stedfastly in the Apostles*  
*Doctrine and fellowship, in breaking*  
*of bread, and in prayers;* but we  
 see no kind of mention made of  
 the cup, but rather a confirmation  
 of the contrary, as is manifest by  
 the 46 verse of the same Chap-  
 ter: wherefore I may lawfully infer  
 that

that our Saviour Jesus Christ did not oblige all the believers to Communicate in both species; otherwise certainly himself wou'd not be the first transgressor of his own law; neither wou'd he promise everlasting life to those who wou'd receive the communion under the forme of bread, as he did, John c. 6 v: 51 saying thus; *I am the living bread, which came down from heaven, if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever;* where by we see plainly that everlasting life is promis'd to us, for eating worthily that heavenly bread.

Now let us see did those of the primitive Church ever practice to give the communion in one  
sole

sole species; to prove which will produce the Authority and examples of those, Fathers who then liv'd. Tertulian, who Liv'd the year 230, in his book of Oration c. 14. and in his book ad Uxorem, c. 5. gives understand that it was then custom to carry the Eucharist home for private Communion. St. Ambrose who liv'd in the 4th Century, relates in his Oration Obitu Satyri that then the people were wont to keep the Eucharist about them, and that his brother Satyrus once in a shipwreck was miraculously saved from being drown'd, by the virtue of the blessed Eucharist which was ty'd about his neck.

Fath



St. Basil, who liv'd in the same Century expressly affirms (in his Epist: to Cæsaria Patricia) that it was a common practice to bring the Eucharist home to their houses, and to receive it, when they pleas'd; which is a manifest sign that then the people did not always receive the Communion in both species, for those who took it under the forme of wine, receiv'd it in the Church from the Priests, or Deacons; as St. Cyprian relates in his ser. De lapsis, and those who pleas'd to bring it home under the forme of bread for privat Communion were not hinder'd; until by reason of several abuses, which happen'd; the Fathers of the Council of Cæsaragust:

August: who saith the year 382 Can:  
3, prohibit'd it. St. Denis who  
liv'd in the 2 Century in his book  
de Eccles: Hier: the last Chap: af-  
firms that it was then a custom to  
give the Communion to the chil-  
dren under the form of wine, and  
St. Cyprian, who liv'd the year  
250 in his sermon Delapsis, makes  
mention of a certain child, who  
receiv'd the Communion under  
the forme of wine, and also of  
three more who receiv'd it un-  
der one sole species. St. Denis of  
Alexandria, who has been St. Cy-  
prians contemporary, in his Epistle  
to Tobias, tells of a certain Priest  
who gave a particle of the con-  
secrat'd host to a boy, in order to  
bring it, to Ierapion, who was  
despe

desperate ill in his dying bead.  
Paulinus, who has been very familiar with St. Ambrose, and present at his death, relates (writing his life) that he receiv'd the Communion only under the form of bread; and St. Basil did the same, as also we read in his Life; which neither of them wou'd offer to do, if they had believ'd it to be either against the doctrine of the Church, or the institution of Christ. *Sozomenus* in his 8 book c: 5, & *Nicephorus* in his 13: Book c: 7 writes of a certain womā who was infected by the Macedonian heresie; but thinking to conceal her wickedness, and pretending before the people, to be a Catholick, she receiv'd the blessed Sacrament

crement under the form of bread from the hand of St. Chrysostome, which afterwards she gave privately to her maid thinking to eat in its stead other bread, which shee brought from home; but it seems, that God Almighty was pleas'd to discover her profane intention, for that bread which she thought to eat, was suddenly turn'd into a stone before all the congregatiō. The *Manichees* who abhorr'd wine (believing it to be the Devils gall) never Communicated by only under the forme of bread: as St. Leos 4 Sermon in Lent expressly testifies: but Epiphanius, St. Augustin & several others who writt of the *Manichees* an errors never mention'd that they

they err'd in Receiving the Communion in one sole species. But I acknowledge that the Bishops of Italy about the year. 444. did much Recommend the use of the Chalice, that the Manichees might be discover'd, who lurking amongst the Catholicks alwayes Receiv'd the Communion under the forme of bread; but never the Chalice & whosoever then during that Heresie wou'd not at the publicke Communion of Easter Receive the Chalice was suspected to be a Manichean; whereby the reader may plainly see, that the Church has reason to forbid at one time, what it permits, at an other; Christ having left unto it a dispensing power to

D

alter

alter all matters of indifferency in the discipline thereof, as the time, place, and circumstances wou'd require, which St. Augustin (in his 118. Epist)le openly declares, and it may be confirm'd by St. Pauls first Epistle: to the Corinthians. c. 11 v. 34. but the Manichean heresie being smothered, the Receiving of the Communion under one kind was afterwards Commonly practis'd in the Church as Hugo de sancto Victore, who liv'd about the year 1130 relates in his book

Now before I shall proceed further in my Answer, let the reader observe those four points, which Commonly have been in practice in the Primitive Church (viz.

tha

that then the people wou'd bring the Eucharist home to their houses under the forme of bread for private Communion.

Secondly that the Communion was sent and given to the sick under the same forme.

Thirdly that infants & children Receiv'd the Communion under the forme of wine only:

Fourthly that the Primitive Christians Receiv'd publickly in the Churches; the Communion either under one or both species as they pleas'd, untill the Fathers of the Council of Constance about the year 1414. order'd the layties to Receive in one sole species; not decreeing that the Receiv'g thereof in both species

was unlawfull, or ever prohibited before by the Church; but for several other weighty reasons, of which I shall produce only two.

First, that (thereby) they might suppress and smother the Heresie of certain Germans & Bohemians who then obstinately deny'd the integrity of the Sacrement to be contain'd in one sole species.

Secondly that for the future they might prevent several abuses & prophanations which formerly happen'd, when the Chalice was given to the laity, who thro' their weak zeal, and cold Devotion permitted very oftē drops of the holy blood to be spilt, as St. Chrysostome (in his first Epistle to Innocentius, & Eneas Silvius in his dialogue



*Jenning Challenge.*

51

de utraque specie) relate, which is  
against the sublime Reverence due  
to this most excellent Sacrament.

Wherefore it evidently appears,  
that neither the Grec  $\alpha$ , or Latines  
ever believ'd, that all which is  
written in the Gospel touching  
the Communion under two spe-  
cies, is to be so universally under-  
stood that it Comprehends all  
Christians, but that they alwayes  
suppos'd and believ'd from the  
very begining of Christianity  
that one sole species was sufficient  
for a true & Lawfull Communion;  
so that the Council of Constance  
did but follow the tradition and  
Doctrin of all precedent ages,  
when it defin'd that the Commu-  
nion under, one sole species, was

as good, and as sufficient as under both species; and that those who wou'd Receive it under one kind, wou'd neither contradict the institution of Christ or deprive themselves of the fruit of this holy Sacrament; for whether we eat or whether we drinke, or whether we do both together, we alwayes apply the same Death of Jesus Christ, & alwayes Receive the same substance of the blessed Sacrament, and the same effect of grace, for the true flesh, and blood of Jesus Christ are wholly and intirly contain'd in every drop of the blessed blood, and in every particle of the blessed Host: body as well as he is cōtain'd in the whole cup, or in the whole

Host

or in both, therefore let no bodie foolishly belive, that more benefit is Receiv'd by taking the Communion in two species, than in taking it in one alone; for being that every drop of the blessed blood and every particle of the divided Host, is a maine Ocean of spiritual Blessings, many of them by the same moral action Receiv'd, affords no more grace then one alone; being that one alone contains the whole fountaine intirly: therefore it appears that it was never our Saviours intention to oblige all Christians to Receive the Sacrament in both species, for if this had been his intention, he wou'd certainly institute it, in a materia  
more

more common to all nations, as he did in the institution of the Sacrament of baptism; knowing the wine to be so scarce in several parts of the world, that the poor inhabitants thereof cou'd but very seldom, or perhaps never Receive the Communion for the want of wine, therefore our Saviours intention was (when he said *Drinke ye all of this* to oblige the Disciples who only then were present, and also their successors who are the Priests, that daily offer this most holy Sacrifice under both species, and when he said to his Disciples *John c. 6. v. 63.* that the flesh profiteth nothing, his meaning was, that it profiteth nothing to believe

*Iening challenge*

55

believe his bodie to be only human flesh excluding the divine nature as the Jews beliv'd, who deny'd Christ to be the son of God.

*Chap 3. proving that the Common Prayers were in languages not generally understood by all those of the Primitive Church.*

The holy scripture encourages us to pray tho' we understand not what is said: therefore it is lawfull and expedient for us to pray tho' we understand not what is said the antecedent is manifest by St. Pauls first Epist: to the Corinthians, chap. 14. v. 2 where he sayes thus: *he that speaketh in an unknown tongue, speaketh not unto men but unto God, for no man understandeth*

*standeth him.* Nay some times the speaker did not understand what himself said, for the gift of languages and the gift of interpreting languages are two distinct gifts, as is evident by the 11. v. and did not alwayes meet together as may be seen by the 13. v. of the aforesaid chapter for there the Apostle exhorts *him who speaketh in an unknown tongue to pray that he may interpret;* which is a sign that ordinarily he cou'd not; as is manifest by the 14. v; where he sayes thus; *If I pray in an unknown tongue my spirit pray eth, but my understanding is unfruitfull* where plainly you see, that St. Paul only affirms our understanding to be unfruitfull and not  
our

our prayers, when we pray in an unknown tongue; moreover you see, that St. Paul gives to understand that it is lawfull, and not prohibited to pray in an unknown tongue.

Now let us prove the consequence what the Apostles did, and practis'd, is lawfull and expedient for us to practice: but the Apostles publick liturgies have been in languages, which were not Generally understood by all the nations they Converted: therefore tis lawfull and expedient for our liturgies to be in a language not generally understood by all nations that use them: the major is evident and I shall prove the Minor, The  
Apostles

Apostles publick liturgies were all in Hebrew, Greeck, Syriack, or Latine, (as is manifest by all Ancient writers,) which were not generally known languages, to all nor half the Nations by them converted, and it was also in the same languages those of the primitive Church had their own publick liturgies, after the Apostles death, as all the following Fathers doe openly declare St Ciprian (who liv'd in the 3 Century expounding the Lords Prayer) affirms that then the publick liturgie was in Latin, and St. Augustin in his book de Dono p̄sentis; chap. 13, in his 2. book de Doctrin Christiana chap. 13, and also expounding the 123. psal:



Plal: and in his 173. Epistle declares that all the western Churches had their Masse in Latin and St. Hierome (*Prefat: in Paralip:*) affirms that all the Eastern Churches had their Masse in Greek and v<sup>s</sup>d St. Basils Greek liturgie: but then the Latin and Greek were not the vulgar languages of all Nations for before those times there were several other languages as is manifest, by the acts of the Apostles: Chap: 2. v. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. where we read the following words: *and they were all fill'd with the holy Ghost, and began to speake with other tongues, as the spirit gave them utterance. And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men out of every Nation under Heaven.*

60      *An Answer to mr.*

heaven, Now when this was nois'd  
abroad the multitude came together  
and were confounded, because that  
every man heard them speake in his  
own language, and they were all a-  
maz'd, and marvell'd, saying one to  
an other; behold, are not all these who  
speak Galileans, and how hear we  
every man in our tongue, wherein  
we were born. Whereby it plainly  
appears, that neither the Apostles  
or the Fathers of the Primitive  
Church, ever judg'd it to be ex-  
pedient or necessary to translate  
the publick liturgie into the mo-  
ther tongue of every Nation; nor  
consequently that it was Requi-  
site, that it shuld be immediatly  
and expressly understood by eve-  
ry one of the hearers; for they  
knew

knew too well that the end, for which the publick liturgie has been first instituted, does not require this: for the drift which the Church had in appointing liturgies, is that thereby a continual tribute, or homage of prayers, and thanksgivings, might be publicly offer'd to God by the Priest & also that the Christians (by their personal assistance at this publick service might unanimously exercise exterior acts of Religion agreeing With the whole Church represented by the Ecclesiastical meeting of every pious congregation: moreover that every Christian by his presence at this service, might consent to the publick Prayers, and  
thanks

thanksgiving of the Church, in order to be made partaker of the graces, fruits, and benefits, which the Church commonly obtaines by its liturgies and publick oblation, for when the Priest celebrates Masse, or sayes any publick prayers belonging to it, he offers them to God for the people present, for the whole Church, or for any other necessity of the people who are absent: so that it matters not, whether the people understands him or no: because they have as much benefit by his prayers, and oblation as if they had understood what he sayes; for if they hear him not speaking a word, they might be partakers of his prayers, and intercession, being

being God to whom they are offer'd, hears and understands him: for in Sacrifices, Prayers, and thanksgivings; the Priest speaks not to the Congregation, but to God: according to that of St. Paul's first Epist. to the Corinth: c. 14 v. 2: which is Confirm'd by the following example: when any man layes sick, or in distress at home, he sends to the Church to be pray'd for, by the Priest, and Congregation: now, shall we believe? because he neither hears, or understands the prayers offer'd for him, that he obtains no benefit thereby? no, (the Lord forbid) for if so, the Prayers of the Righteous wou'd avail nothing, which is against that of St. James.

c. 5. v. 15 16: and which is more, we wou'd never be the better for our Saviours intercession for us, to his heavenly Father: because we neither heare nor understand him, or know when he intercedes for us: yet we Receive innumerable benefits by his intercession: and also by the Priests intercession, when he Celebrats Masse, or sayes any other publick office or prayers instituted by the Church: for in this Common office he represents our Saviours place on earth: and we are certain that the fervent Prayers of a Righteous man availeth much, according to that of St. James c. 5. v. 15. 16. whether we understand them, or no: for their effects doe not depend

of our intelligence, but rather of the acceptation of God Almighty, to whom they are offer'd.

But now to discover the folly of those who do uncharitably censure the Church of Rome for having her Common Prayers in an unknown tongue: let them know, that there are many Millions of the said Church, who doe understand it in Latin and those who doe not, that they are so well instructed by the Clergy, that they know when to kneel, when to stand, when to Pray, when to give thanks, and when to do reverence, and when not: besides they have the most part of the Masse if not the whole, in their English, Italian, French, Dutch,

Ea

and

and Spanish prayer books: which also was formerly in the Irish prayer books, and would continue so still; but that the penallawes of that Kingdom (in Queen Elizabeth's reign) prohibited any Irish Schooles; which oblig'd them to use their Prayers in Latin and English: except some of the vulgar, who were not able to allow their Children Schooling to learn either of them: yet they have traditionally from their Clergy and parents their prayers and other necessary instructions in Irish, taught them by word of mouth, and also that part of the Masse wherein they might have any doubt, or scruple. So that it is not said in Latin by

the Chu



the Priest, to the intent that the people might not understand him; or to the intent that the flock might be kept in darkne's (as some of the pretended Reformers doe falsely reporte) but to the intent that the holy Catholick Church in her Liturgies might use one generall, & Common language, wherein all Nations doe indisputably agree, & which is more practis'd than any other language, by the whole world; so that if one travels thro' all Europe, he shall alwayes find the same liturgie us'd in all Catholick Churches which conformity is a manifest sign of good Government, which is in the Church of Rome.

*Chap. 4 Proving the Pope of Rome's  
Supremacy in the Primitive Church.*

Christ's promise to St. Peter, and the charge which he committed unto him after his resurrection, requires some chief and Universal Pastor in the Church, whom all the rest ought to obey: but it was alwayes believ'd in the Primitive Church, St. Peter and his successor (the Pope of Rome) to have been that chief and Universal Pastor: therefore it was alwayes believ'd in the Primitive Church, St. Peter and his successor (the Pope of Rome) to have been the chief and Universal Pastor, whom all the rest ought to obey: the minor and consequence are manifest: as shall ap

pear hereafter. In the mean time,  
let us hear our Saviour's Promise  
to St. Peter: Matt: chap. 16.v: 18.

*and I say also unto you, that thou art  
Peter, and upon this Rock I will build  
my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall  
not prevail against it.* By which

words our Saviour promis'd the  
supream Government of the who-  
le Church on Earth, to St. Peter:

as all the following Fathers and  
Doctors, do openly Declare. Ori-

genes Homily 5 in Exodus, Ter-  
tullian in his book de Præscrip:

St. Cyprian in his Epist: to Quin-  
tus: St. Athanasius in his Epist:

to Felix: St. Basil in his 2 book a-  
gainst Eunomius. St. Hilarius &

St. Hierome expounding the a-  
foresaid text: St. Chrysostome

70      *An Answer to mr,*  
Hom: 55. in Matt: St. Cyrill of  
Alexandria in his 2 book c. 2: in  
Ioann: St. Ambrose 1er: 47.  
and in his book de Isaac c. 3, St.  
Leo 1er: 11. of our Saviours Passi-  
on, and in his 2 1er: of St. Peter  
and St. Paul, St. Augustin in Psal:  
Contra partem Donati, and in  
his 2 book against Gaudentius  
Epistles, c. 23. which promise was  
effectually fullfil'd after Christ's  
Relurrection, as all the aforesaid  
Fathers doe Testifie: and it mani-  
festly appears by our Saviour's  
own words: Iohn c. 21, v. 15 16.  
& 17 where we read that Christ  
Commanded St. Peter thrice con-  
sequently to feed the flock, say-  
ing thus: *feed my Lambs, feed my*  
*Lambs, feed my Sheep,* which words  
doe

doe plainly make-out, that it was our Saviour's intention to appoint Peter the Supream head and chief pastor over all Christians, under himself on earth: which is further Confirm'd by the following Testimonies. S. Denis the Areopagite (cited by S. Damascen ora: 2. de dormitione Deiparæ affirms, that he and Timothy were both present: at the blessed Virgin Mary's death, to be hold that body, which gave the begining of life: and that there was also present both James, and Peter the Supream, and most ancient top of Divines. S. Irenæus (who liv'd in the 2 Age, in his 3 book c 3.) says, that all Churches round about ought to resort the Roman Church, by reason of her more powerfull Principality

cipality. Tertullia (who liv'd in the year 230. in his book call'd *Scorpiacus* c 10, speaking to a heretick) sayes thus: *for altho' you think heaven to be still shut up: remember the Lord to have left here it's keys, with Peter, and by Peter to the Church.* Origines (who liv'd about the same time. Hom 5 in *Exod:*) sayes thus: *Observe what the Lord said to that great foundation of the Church, and most solid Rock upon whom Christ built his Church.* And on the 6 Chap. of S. Paul's. *Epist: to the Rom:* he also sayes, the following whords: *when the chief charge of feedig Christ's sheep was given to S. Peter, and the Church found'd upon him... there was requir'd of him the Confession of no vertue, but of Charity.* S. Cyprian

(who also liv'd in the same Century. Epist. to Iulian) sayes thus: we hold Peter to be the head & root of the Church. Epist: 57, he sayes the following words: Peter upon whom the Church hath been built spoke for all, answering in the Church's name sayig, Lord to whom shall we go: and in his 71. Epist: he also sayes thus: Peter whom the Lord first choes'd, and upon whom he built his Church. St. Epiphanius, who liv'd in the year 370. sayes' (heresie 51) that Christ choes'd Peter first in order to make him the Captaine of his Disciples; and heresie 52, he calls, St. Peter the Prince of the Apostles, St. Ambrose, who also liv'd about that same time, in his Commentary on St. Paul's Epist. to the Gala: 6. 7, speaking of St. Paul sayes thus:

thus: *It was fit, that he long'd for to see Peter, who was the chiefest of the Apostles, to whom our Saviour intrusted the care of all the Churches. and also in his Commentary on St Paul's 2. Epist: to the Corin: c: 12, he says: Andrew first followed our Saviour, yet Andrew Receiv'd not the supremacy, but Peter. Optatus, who liv'd in the year 365. saves thus (in his 2. book against Perminian) there is one chair, and you dare not deny to know that the chair was first bestowed unto Peter in the City of Rome, where Peter the head of all the Apostles continued. S. Basil (who also liv'd in the same age in his ser. de Iudicio dei) calls Peter, that blessed one, who was prefer'd before the rest of the Apostles. Eusebius Emislenus (who also liv'd about*



about the same time, in his ser:  
 de nativi: St. Joan. speaking of  
 Christ) says. *that he first committed*  
*his Lambs, afterwards his sheep to*  
*Peter, because he made him not only*  
*pastor, but pastor of pastors; and Ecu-*  
*menius, who likewise then liv'd,*  
*sayes the following words, in his*  
*commentary on the 1. Cap. of the*  
*acts, Not James, but Peter rais'd up,*  
*as being both more fervent, and also*  
*the president of the Disciples. S. Cy-*  
*rill of Ierusalem (who liv'd in the*  
*same Century, Catech: 2: sayes*  
*thus, Peter the Prince and most excel-*  
*lent of all the Apostles St. Hierome*  
*(who liv'd, in the year 390, in his*  
*first book against the Pelagians*  
*c. 14) calls, Peter, the Prince of the*  
*Apostles, upon whom the Lord's Church*  
*have*

*hast been built: and also in his first book against Jovinian Cap: 14, he sayes, That one of the twelve was chosen to be the head of the rest, that the occasion of schisme might be prevented St. Chrysostom, [who liv'd in the same time, in his 2 Hom: de pænit: in Psal. 50] calls St Peter the pillar of the Church, the foundation of the faith, and the head of the Apostolical quire: and in his last Hom: on Iohn he sayes, that the charge of the brethren (that is to say, of the Apostles) & of the whole world was committed to Peter: and also in his 55 hom: on Matt: he sayes; that the pastor and head of the Church was once a poor fisherman. Theodoretus who liv'd in the year 430. sayes thus, [in his Epist: to Leo.] Paul that preacher*

*Jennings challenge.* 77

*of the truth, and trumpet of the holy Ghost, run'd to great Peter, that he might bring his sentence to those, who indevor'd, to establish the legals, in Antioch. S. Augustin who liv'd in the same age (in his 24 Ser: de Temp:) call's Peter, the governer of the Church. And in his 68. Epitt: he calls him, the head of the Apostles, the gate-keeper of heaven, &c. & in his last Treatise in Ioan: he sayes thus: whom Peter by reason of the Supremacy of his apostle-ship &c. S. Leo (who liv'd in the year 440, in his 3 ser: de Assump: sua ad Pontif:) saves the following words: out of the whole world one Peter is choisen, who is prefer'd before all people, and before the apostles, and before all the fathers of the Church, and*  
*a. b. j.*

altho' among the people of God there  
be many Priests, and many pastors, yet  
Peter particularly governs them all  
and Christ governs them principally.  
S Gregory (in his 4. book 32. E-  
pist: which is to Mauritius the  
Emperor) sayes: that it was manifest  
to all that knew the Gospell, the char-  
ge of the whole Church to have been  
committed by the Lord to Peter the Prin-  
ce of all the Apostle. And the Ge-  
neral Council of Calcedon, whe-  
rein 630 Fathers were assembled,  
call'd (action 3) S. Peter the Rock  
and pillar of the Church. All which  
proofs do sufficiently make out,  
that it was alwayes believ'd, and  
acknowledg'd, by those of the  
Primitive Church, St. Peter to  
have been instituted a supream  
pastor

pastor: but the same charge still remains, being the office of a pastor is an ordinary, and a perpetual office. and as long as there are sheep to be feed, so long there ought to be a pastor to feed them, which because St. Peter did not perform in his own person those many hundred years; there must needs be some other lawfull successor, to execute the office in his place: for we see by daily experience many strifes and contentions to happen amongst the flock, in matters of faith and discipline: who then shall appease & reconcile them? you will say the Bishops; but how often doth differences of this sort arise, and happen amongst the Bishops  
 F them-

themselves? perhaps you will answer, that they ought to appeal to Primates and Patriarches: but what if they be also at variance? as Flavianus and Dioscorus, Cyrill and Nestor were: peradventure you may say: that they ought to goe to temporal princes, and civil Magistrates: but tis not their part to ingage themselves in Ecclesiastical affairs; and their factions may be more dangerous then any of the former: to whom then shall the people appeal? it will be said, to a general Council: but who shall summon? who shall order? or who shall direct, and guide that assembly? what if they decline from the true faith of Iesus Christ? as the Council of Ariminum

minium, the second Council of Ephesus, and several other schismatical Councils did? who then shall Iudge their case? who shall decide their dissentions? unless some certain head be appointed by the divine providence of the holy Ghost: whose decrees are infallible & whose censures ought to be obey'd, and in respect of whom St. Peter may be still said to perform his duty, and feed the sheep intrusted to his charges as the premisses do plainly make out

Now let us see, if those of the Primitive Church did believe, and acknowledge, the Popes of Rome (successively from age to age, since Peter's death) to have been that Supream head of the Uni-

versal Church (as St Peter was in his own time, St. Irenous, who liv'd in the year 180, in his 3 book Chap 3) sayes, the following words: *The founders of the Church deliver'd the Episcopacy of over-seeing the Church to Linus, and Anacleus succeeded Linus, Clemens, Anacletus, Evaristus, Clemens: &c.* numbring all the rest of the Popes of Rome, who govern'd the Church, from St. Peter's time, to that very instant. St. Basil (who liv'd, in the 4 Century, in his 52 Epist: which is to St. Athanasius) sayes thus: *It is convenient, that we shu'd write to the Bishop of Rome, that he might take notice of what is done here, and produce his sentence .... and use his Authority in the case, & choose some sound*



men.... who can correct those stubborn  
and crosse people, that are here with  
us...and cancel what has been done,  
by force and violence in Ariminum.  
St. Athanasius (in his Ep: written  
in the name of all the Bishops in  
Egypt, to Marke Pope of Rome)  
sayes the following words: To  
the holy and Venerable Marke, Pope  
of the Universal Church, ruler of the  
holy Apostolical sea... we desire (by the  
Authority of your holy sea which is  
the Mother, and head of all Churches,)  
that we may know by the present lega-  
tes, what ought to be done, for the re-  
covery and correction of the faithfull  
Orthodox: ifo being supported by your  
Authority, and strength'd by your  
Prayers, we can escape safe from the  
enemies of God's Church, and ours...

84      *An Answer to mr.*

*& be able to root-out those committed unto us. such an other convincing Authority may be seen, in St Athanasius's Epist: to Felix, and also in St, Cyprian's Epistles, to Cornelius, Lucius, and Stephen, Popes of Rome. St, Hierome (in his Epistle, to Pope Damas) sayes thus: altho' your grandeur terrifies me. yet your mildness invites me I do crave from the Priest, the victim of Salvation, from the Pastor, succour to a sheep... I speake to the successor of the fisher, and disciple of the cross, following none but Christ, I do joyne with your holynesse in communion, that is to say, with the chaier of Peter, for I know the Church to have been built upon that Rocke: whosoever shall eat the lamb out of this house, is prophane:*

phane: St Crylostome (in his first Epist: to Pope Innocentius beseeches him, to declare the proceedings of the Eastern Bishops void, and of no effect, and to punish (with Ecclesiastical Censure) the promoters of the discorde, and in his 2 book (de Sacerdotio Chap 1) he sayes the following words (speaking of Christ) why did he shed his own blood? certainly it was to purchase those sheep, whose care he committed both to Peter, and to Peter's successors, Theodoretus (in his Epist. to Pope Leo) sayes thus: I do expect the sentence of your Apostolical sea; and I humbly beseech, and Pray your holynesse, that your just and upright judgment may aide me, appealing to you, and command me to come before you: & in his Epist: to Renatus,

Renatus, he also sayes thus: I beseech you to perswade the most holy Archbishop Leo to use his Apostolicall Authority, and command me to appear, at your Council, for that holy see has, the Government of all Churches thro' the whole world: St Augustin (in his 262 Epist: which is to Pope Celestinus) sayes the following words: I congratulate your merits, that our Lord estab.ish'd you in that see, without any opposition of the people. secondly I do inform your holynesse of what is committed near us here that, not only by praying for us, but also by advising and assisting us, you may relieve us.... I beseech you thro' the blood of Christ and remembrance of the Apostle Peter (who admonish'd the chiefest of the Christian people) not to (for

for these things to be done. All which  
Authorities do plainly make-out,  
that the holy Fathers and Doctors  
of the primitive Church firmly  
believ'd, and acknowledg'd, the  
Popes of Rome to have been (suc-  
cessively from age, to age,) the  
Supream head of the Universal  
Church on earth: Which may be  
further confirm'd by the cōtinual  
practice, and consent of several  
Nations: who in the primitive  
Church appeal'd to the Popes of  
Rome: acknowledging each of  
them [in his own time] to have  
been Christ's Vicar-generall on  
earth: As for exemple, to whose  
high tribunal did Flavianus the  
Patriarch of Constantinople ap-  
peal from the a Ephesian Coun-  
cil

cil: but to that of Leo Pope of Rome: as Liberatus in his breviare c. 12. writes; whose assistance did Athanasius Bishop of Alexandria (depos'd by the Arians) implore but the assistance of Marke, Felix and Iulius, Popes of Rome: as St. Athanasius's own Epistles (the aforesaid) do expressly testify and also Sozomenus, in his 3. book c. 7. Under whose wings, did St. Chrysostome fly, for justice? (being depos'd by Theophilus, and his adherences) but under the wing of Innocentius the first: as appears by St. Chrysostome's 1. & 2. Epistles to the same. To whom did Fortunatus, & Felix (being depos'd in Africk) appeal? but to Cornelius Pope of Rome: as St. Cyprian

his first book Epist: 3: declares.  
To whom did Basilide appeal? but  
to Pope Stephen, as St. Cyprian  
testifies, Epist: 68. To the Pope  
of Rome, Valent, and Ursacius  
came to give an account of their  
treachery against St. Athanasius,  
and to crave pardon for the same  
as Epiphanius (heresie 68. relates)  
Marcion (being excommunicated  
by his own Bishop in Asia) came  
to Rome, to be absolv'd by Pius  
the first: as St. Epiphanius re-  
lates, (heresie 42) who depos'd  
Anthimus, the Patriarch of Con-  
stantinople? and establish'd in his  
place Mena; but Agapetus the  
Pope, as Liberatus affirms in his  
breviate 62. and also Zonarias,  
writing the life of Iustinian. Who  
de-

depos'd Flavianus the Patriarch  
of Antioch? but Pope Damas, as a  
Theodoret relates, in his 5<sup>th</sup> book  
c 23. who depos'd Polychronius  
Bishop of Ierusalem, about the  
year 434, but Pope Sixtus, the Pope  
as appears, in the acts of Sixtus  
Who depos'd Dioscorus Patriarch  
of Alexandria? but the Council  
of Rome: as Gelatius's Epistle that he  
the Dardanian Bishops, expressly  
declares: wherein he also relates  
that Pope Iulius the first, restored  
Athanasius Alexandrinus, Patriarch  
Constantinopolitanus, & Marcellus  
Iulius Ancyranus to their own  
sees, who re-establish'd Paulinus  
(St. Athanasius successor) who  
wrongfully depos'd by the Arians,  
ans) but Pope Damas: as Sozomen



*Jennings Challenge* 91

nas, as affirms, in his 6 book c: 39. who  
s befallor'd Theodoretus (being also  
wrongfully depos'd, by the Aeri-  
urans in the 2 Ephesian synod), but  
s, the Pope Leo: as is manifest by the  
Sixth action of the General Coun-  
cil of Calcedon.

then it was, only the Popes of Rome,  
istly that had (in the Primitive Chur.  
proph) their deputies, and Vicar-  
rel generals in all foraign and re-  
est remote Countreyes (viz.) Anastasius  
Patriarch of Thesalónica, in the Ori-  
ent: as appears by St. Leo's 84  
Epist: Potentius in Africk as the  
d Pope Leo's 87 Epist declares: A-  
benacius Patriarch of Constantino-  
ple, in Egypt: whom the Pope of  
Rome, commanded to depose the  
Bishop of Alexandria, as Gelatius,  
relates,

relates in his Epist. to the Danish Bishops. Celestinus Pope of Rome, Authoriz'd St. Cyrill of Alexandria to proceed against Nestor (then Bishop of Constantinople) as appears by Celestinus's Ep: to St. Cyrill: which is to be seen in St. Cyrill's 4. tome where also St. Cyrill declares) in his Epist: to those of Constantinople) that the charge of that Bishoprick, was committed unto himself by the Bishop of Rome Pope Hormisda instituted Salustius (Bishop of Sevil) his Vicar general through Spain, and Portugal, as appears by the said Legat Hormisda's Epist: to the same and St. Gregory instituted Vigilius Bishop of Orleance to

and is Vicargeneral, thro' all Fran-  
ce: as may be seen, in St Gregory's  
4th. book Epist: 52.

It was also the Pope of Rome's  
Legates, that were Presidents in  
the General Councils of the Pri-  
mitive Church, as for example;  
Hosius, Vitus, and Vincentius,  
in St. Sylvester's Legates, have been  
presidents in the General Coun-  
cil of Nice: as Cedrinus in his  
Compendio, Potius in his book  
de 7, Synodis, and St: Athanasius  
in his Epist. (to those, who leade  
a solitary life) do relate. St Cyrill  
of Alexandria, Pope Calistinus's  
legate preceded, in the Coun-  
cil of Ephesus as Liberatus in his  
Breviate 6, 15, & Evagrius in his  
book 6. 4. do write. Paschasius

Lu

Lucenſius, and Bonifacius, St. Leo's Legates, were Presidents in the General Council of Calcedon: as is evident by the 3<sup>d</sup> action of the ſame Council, and alſo by S. Leo's 47 Epist: Archidamus, and Philaxenus. Iulius the firſt's Legates, preceded in the General Council of Sardis: as St. Athanaſius in his 2 Apology, and Theodoretus in his 2 book c 15, do declare.

It was, only to the Pope of Rome, the decrees and Canons, of all General, and famous Councils, were ſent (in the primitive Church) in order to be approv'd, and confirm'd, by his holynesse: as for example: it was, to St. Sylveſter Pope of Rome, the Fathers

of the Council of Nice, sent a letter most humbly beseeching his holynesse, to Ratifie and confirme, the decrees of the said Council: which letter is to be seen in the second Tome of the Councils. The Fathers of this Council, were in number, 318, and sate in the year 325. The Fathers of the General Council of Constantinople (being in number 150, assembled in the year 381) writ to Damas Pope of Rome, by (Cyriacus Eusebius, and Priscianus, Bishops) praying him, to approve and confirme their Canons: this Councils letter, is to be seen in Theodoret's 5th. book c. 9. The decrees of the General Council of Ephesus (wherein 200 Fathers sate, in the year

431) were sent to Pope Celestinus, in order to be confirm'd: as St. Cyrill's Epist: testifies: which Epistle is to be seen in the 3 Tome of the Councils. The Fathers of the General Council of Calcedon (being in number 630, and sate in the year 451) sent their Canons, to Pope Leo, in order to be confirm'd, by him: as appears, by the said Council's Epistle to the same; which is to be seen in the 4th: Tome of the Councils. The Fathers of the Milevian Council, sent their Canons to Pope Innocentius the first, (in the year 416) to be confirm'd: as appears, by this Council's Epistle; which is to be seen in the 1 Tome of the Councils. The Fathers of the Council of Carthage

thage, sent their Canons, (the year 336) to be confirm'd, by Pope Stephen: as is manifest, by their own Epistle, which is to be seen, in St. Cyrill's 2 book, and also in the first Tome of the Councils

I might produce several other convincing proofs, concerning this point; but that I may be easie to the reader: I will conclude, only with these followig Councils, who sate, in the Primitive Church and acknowledg'd in their very Canons, the Pope of Rome's Supremacy (viz.) the 20 chap: of the Council of Rome, who sate in the year 324. The 3 chap: of the 3<sup>d</sup> & 4th: Council of Rome, who sate in the year 502. The 3, 4th & 9th Canon, of the Council of Sardis

wherein 376 Fathers were. The 6th Canon of the General Council of Nice. The 5 Canō of the General Council of Constantinople. The 1, 2, 3, & 16. Actiō of the General Council of Calcedon, who sayes thus: (in the 16th) we thoroughly consider truly, that all Primacy & chief honour, is to be kept, for the Arch Bishop of old Rome.

*Chap: 5. Proving, that the Real Presence, was believ'd by those of the Primitive Church*

The very words of Iesus Christ, and also the Authentical Testimonies of the holy Fathers and Doctors of the Primitive Church do clearly affirm, that Christ's true body and blood, are Really and Substantially present, in the



Jennings Challenge 699

the holy Sacrament: therefore  
this Doctrine was not newly bro-  
ught-in, since the Primitive  
Church: the consequens is most  
certain, as we shall see here-after,  
and I prove the first part of the  
Antecedent, by our Saviour's own  
words, Iohn c 6 v 51, where he  
sayes thus: I am the living bread,  
which came down from heaven, if any  
man eat of this bread, he shall live  
forever: and the bread that I will give  
is my flesh, which I will give for the  
life of the world. But then the Jewes  
wanting true faith, said one to  
another: how can this man give  
us his flesh to eat v 52. certainly  
then our Saviour (who came to  
this world to instruct, and leade  
us, out of all darknesse, to the true

light) hearing the Iewes murmuring so, and doubting of what he said to be true, wou'd explain the aforelaid words, if he had any mystical meaning: but he was so far from so doing, that he confirm'd and repeated them again, over and over as is manifest by the 53 54 &c. v: where we read the following words. *then Iesus said unto them, verily verily I say unto ye, except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drinke his blood, ye have no life in ye: whosoever eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life and I will raise him up at the last day: for my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drinke indeed: he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him; as the*  
living

## Jennings Challenge

For

living Father hath sent me and I live  
by the Father: so he that eateth me,  
even he shall live by me. This is the  
bread which came down from heaven:  
not as your Fathers did eat manna,  
and are dead, he that eateth of this  
bread shall live for ever. So that eve-  
ry faithfull & sincere Christian  
may plainly understand, that if  
our Saviour then had not meant,  
that he was to give his own true  
flesh and blood to be really eaten  
and dranke, that he wou'd not so  
proceed, in confirming what he  
said in the beginning, and also  
that he wou'd not suffer his own  
disciples to part with-out declar-  
ing his mind to them, as he did  
often before, when he spoke in  
parables; neither wou'd he decla

re

re, at his last supper, that he gave to his disciples, his own body and blood, saying thus: *Take eate, this is my body: and he tooke the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying drinke ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many for the remission of sinnes.* *Matt: c 26 v: 26 27 & 28*

I leave it to all faithfull Christians, seriously to be consider'd, whether Christ gave, only figuratively his own body and blood, for the remission of our sinnes, or his reall body and blood? If he gave them really for our Salvation; he also gave them really to his disciples, as his own words do manifestly affirme; to deny which, is of no less consequence, than

than to charge Christ with untruth: or at least that he had not words significant, to explain his intention; which is rash and impious to judge of his infinite power: therefore all Christians are oblig'd not to mistrust of the truth of Christ's words, or doubt of their literal sence, in the aforesaid text: for being we acknowledge, that Christ is omnipotent, and consequently that it is in his Power to make of the bread and wine his own flesh and blood, (by his divine benediction) we ought not to doubt of what he said to be true; and if in case he had not exprest so plainly his mind unto us, concerning this mysterie, we ought to believe it firmly, by St. Paul's

Paul's testimonye (j<sup>a</sup> Corinth.  
c: 11 v: 23 24 &c.) saying thus: for  
I have receiv'd of the Lord, that which  
also I deliver'd unto ye; that the Lord  
Jesus (the same night in which he was  
betrayed) tooke bread, and when he had  
given thanks, he brake and said, take  
eat, this is my body which shall  
be deliver'd for ye, this doe ye in remem-  
brance of me: after the same manner also  
he tooke the cup when he had supped,  
saying this cup is the new testament in  
my blood, this doe ye, as often as ye  
drinke it in remembrance of me; for  
as often as ye eat this bread and drinke  
this cup, ye do shew the Lords death  
till he come. whosoever shall eat this  
bread, or drinke this cup of the Lord  
unworthily, shall be guilty of the body  
and blood of the Lord. By which  
words

words St. Paul openly declares, that Christ gave his own body & blood to his disciples, at his last supper; and also he affirms, himself to have been taught this doctrine, by the Lord; and that he deliver'd the same, to the Corinthians, that thereby he might persuade them not to doubt of what he said to be true; but to firmly believe the real presence, being it was the Lords doctrine deliver'd unto him, in order to teach it to the Christians.

Now let us heare the Authority of the holy Fathers & Doctors of the Primitive Church, where-with I shall prove the second Part of the antecedent. St. Ignarius the Apostles Disciple. in his

First

Epist: to those of Smyrna, cited  
by Theodoret in his Dialogues  
Hayes thus: they admit not the E-  
ucharists and oblations, because they  
confess not the Eucharist to be the flesh  
of our Saviour, who suffer'd for our  
sinne. Let the reader take notice  
of those heretickes, against whose  
principles St. Ignatius speaks in  
the aforesaid text: for they re-  
jected the Eucharist, lest they would  
be forc'd to confess, that Christ  
had true flesh: but if the Eucha-  
rist had not then been believed  
to be Christ's true flesh, those he-  
reticks could have no kind of rea-  
son to re-ject it, for they did not  
deny the figure or Image of Christ  
but what they deny'd was, that  
Christ had true flesh. The like  
gum



may be form'd against the Jewes  
admiration (hearing the words of  
Christ John 6:6 v. 51 &c.) for if  
then the Jewes would believe that  
Christ was to give his flesh  
only in figure and remembrance,  
they would have no reason  
to murmur, or to mistrust the truth  
of Christ's words: so that it  
manifestly appears, that the Jewes  
suppos'd, that Christ meant his  
true flesh; and also that those he-  
reticks of the primitive Church be-  
liev'd and acknowledge, that it  
was then some of the Catholick  
Doctrine, to believe that Christ's  
true flesh, was really present in  
the holy Eucharist. St. Iustin  
Martyr (who liv'd in the year 130,  
in his 2. Apology to Antoninus)  
says

sayes thus: we do not receive this  
as common bread, or as common drinke,  
but as the son of God Iesus Christ our  
Saviour incarnate, had flesh and blood  
for our salvation, so . . . are we taught  
that the Eucharist is the flesh & blood  
of the same Iesus incarnate St Irenaeus  
(who liv'd in the same Century,  
speaking of the hereticks of the  
Synagogue, who deny'd, Christ  
to have been the son of God)  
sayes the following words: [in his  
4th book, c 34) how can they be as-  
sured, the bread in which thanks are  
given to be the body of our Lord, & the  
chalice his blood? if they acknowledge  
him not to be the son of the maker of the  
world. Tertullian (who liv'd in  
the year 230) sayes thus: (in his  
book of the resurrection of the  
flesh)

flesh) the flesh is wash'd, that the  
 soul may be clean'd, the flesh is anoin-  
 ted, that the soul may be consecrated,  
 the flesh eateth of the body and blood  
 of Christ: that the soul may be nourish-  
 'd. Origenes (who liv'd in the  
 same age,) sayes thus (hom: 7th in  
 Eum: speakig of the old law) then  
 the manna was meat in figure, but now  
 the flesh of God, is meat in specie, as  
 himself sayes. my flesh is meat in deed:  
 and in his 5th Hom: in diversa  
 loca Evangelij (speaking of the  
 Centurian) he sayes the following  
 words: when you receive the holy meat  
 and uncorrupted banquet, when you  
 receive the bread and cup of life. you  
 eat & drinke the body & blood of the  
 Lord, then the Lord inters into your  
 houses; you therefore (humbling your-  
 self

(self) immitate this Centurian, & say  
 o Lord I am not worthy, that thou shouldest  
 enter into my house. St Cyprian  
 who liv'd in same Century, in his  
 5th; ser: de Lapsis) sayes thus Violence  
 is infer'd to his body & blood  
 & they offend now more the Lord with  
 their hands & mouth, than when they  
 deny'd the Lord, and in his ser: of  
 the Lords supper, he also sayes  
 the following words: the doctrine  
 of this Sacrament is streange,  
 the Evangelical Schooles publish'd  
 this doctrine, & it first appear'd to  
 the world by Christ the teacher thereof, that  
 Christians should drinke blood, where  
 drinking is most strictly forbidden  
 the Authority of the old law... but the  
 Gospel commands to drinke it. Before  
 I shall proceed further, I must  
 take

take notice of St. Cyprian's words positively affirming, that this Doctrine of the real presence has been first taught by Christ, and his Disciples, and also that Christians are commanded to drinke blood, which was prohibited by the old law: for the old law did not prohibit to drinke blood in figure, or in remembrance; for the Jewes did drinke the blood of Christ figuratively, in drinking the water, which flow'd out of the Rocke: therefore that which was prohibited by the old law, was only to drinke true and real blood: but St. Cyprian clearly affirms, that the Gospel commands the Christians to drinke that, which was prohibited by the old law:

H therefore,

therefore St. Cyprian affirm  
that the Christians are comman  
ed by the Gospel, to drinke tr  
and real blood, and consequen  
not in figure, as my adver  
would faine perswade. St. Hila  
us (who liv'd in the 4th: Cen  
ry, in his 18th: book of the T  
nity, says thus: *If the word be tr  
incarnate, we do truly receive the w  
flesh... of the flesh & blood's*  
*there is noe roome left for being*  
*doubt, for by the Lord's own confes*  
*and by our faith, it is truly flesh*  
*truly blood... let us read what is writ*  
*and let us understand what we re*  
*and then we will perform the duty*  
*perfect faith, for according to the*  
*tural truth of Christ in us, what*  
*we learn, unless we learn it from*

learn it imprudently, & impiously;  
 he said, my flesh is meat in deed &c.  
 St. Cyril of Ierusalem (who liv'd  
 in the same Century, Catech: 4)  
 sayes the following words. This  
 of St. Paul's Doctrine can sufficiently  
 make ye most certain concerning the  
 divine mysteries. . . . & seeing Christ  
 himself so affirms, & sayes of the bread,  
 this is my body: who afterwards can  
 presume to doubt? & the same also say-  
 ing & confirming, this is my blood;  
 who I say can doubt? & say, that it  
 is not his blood. St. Ambrose (who  
 also liv'd in the same Century,  
 in his book de My'stery's Initian-  
 dis c 9th:) sayes the following  
 words: Perhaps you may say; I see the  
 contrary; how can you affirm to me, that  
 I can receive Christ's body? & this now

114      An Answer to mr

we are to prove: therefore we use great  
examples, that we may prove this not  
to be what nature form'd, but what be-  
nediction consecrated; & the benedic-  
tion to be of more power, than the na-  
tures, because even the very nature is  
converted by the benediction; Moſes  
threw a rod, which he converted into  
a serpent, & after wards he tooke the  
serpent's tail & converted the same in-  
to a rod: therefore you see the nature of  
the serpent, & of the rod to have been  
mutuallie chang'd by a Prophetical benedic-  
tion. . . . If human benediction be of  
such power, that it can change nature,  
what do we say to the divine consecra-  
tion? where the very words of the Lord  
our Saviour, do worke, for the Sacrament  
which you receive is perfected by the  
words of Christ. what if Elias's words

were



were of such force that they could draw  
 fire out of heaven? will not Christ's words  
 be able to change the nature of the ele-  
 ments? Of all the workes in the world  
 you have read! because he said & they  
 were made, he commanded & they were  
 created: therefore Christ's words which  
 could make that which was not, of no-  
 thing, can they not change these things,  
 which are, into that, which they were  
 not? for it is not less to give things new  
 beings, than to change their natures:  
 but why doe we use arguments? but let  
 us use his own examples, & prove the  
 truth of this mysterie by the Incarnatio's  
 example: did the course of nature take  
 place, when the Lord was born of  
 Mary? ... it is manifest that the Virgin  
 conceived contrary to the order of nature,  
 & this body which we perform is of

116      *An Answer to mr.*

*the Virgin. Why do you inquire here  
the course of nature in Christ's body  
when the Lord himself was born of  
the Virgin beyond the course of nature.  
Surly, the true flesh of Christ was cruci-  
fi'd; & bur'd, truly then the sacrament  
is of that same flesh. Tho' what I  
have already produc'd of this e-  
minent Doctor's, Authority might  
satisfie any impartial reader; yet  
I will adde these other Authori-  
ties of his, confirming the same:  
in his 4th: book de Sacram: c: 5.  
he sayes thus: The Lord Iesus Christ  
declar'd unto us, that we receive his  
own body & blood, why shu'd we doubt  
of his Authority, & testimony. and  
in his 6th: book c: 1, he also sayes  
thus: as our Lord Iesus Christ, is the  
true son of God... even so it is true  
flesh*

flesh, which we receive, as himself said.  
 St. Gregory Nazianzen (who  
 liv'd in the same age, in his  
 Oration de Paschate) sayes, the  
 followings words: *eat the body &  
 drinke the blood, with-out confusion  
 & doubt... be constant firm, & sted-  
 fast, you need not be any thing troubl'd  
 in mind, for the adversary's discourse.*  
 St. Ephrem, (who liv'd in the year  
 365, in his book de Natura Dei  
 minima Scrutanda c: 5) sayes the  
 following words: *why do you track-  
 out unsearchable things? If you search  
 curiously these things, now you will  
 not be call'd faithfull, but curious, be  
 faithfull & innocent partake of the  
 immaculate body of thy Lord, with  
 full faith, being sure that you do eat  
 the intire lambe, the mysteries of Christ  
 are*

are everlasting fire, do not rashly seat  
 them over, lest you should burn in the  
 ir search. St. Epiphanius (who liv'd  
 in the year 370, in his book nam'd  
 Ancoratus] sayes thus: We see that  
 our Saviour tooke in his ianas (as the  
 Evangelist hath) ... & when he gave  
 thanks, he said this is my body ... &  
 none mistrusts his words, for he who  
 dose not believe, it to be his true flesh  
 falls from grace & life; and in a no-  
 ther place (cited by the Fathers  
 of the 7th: General Council, in  
 the 6th: Action) he sayes the fol-  
 lowing words: Never shall y<sup>e</sup> find  
 our Lord, or his Apostles, or the Fa-  
 thers, saying that the unbloody sacri-  
 fice, which is offer'd by the Priests,  
 is an Image, but his very body & blood  
 St. Hierome (who liv'd in the year

190, Epist: to Hedib:) sayes thus:  
 but let us know, that the bread which  
 the Lord brake & gave to his Disci-  
 ples, was the Lord our Savionrs body;  
 himself saying to them, take ye, &  
 eat this is my body. St, Chrysoston,  
 (who liv'd the year 398, Hom:  
 11 in Matt:) sayes, the following  
 words: he who bestowed his own life  
 for you, why will he scorn to give you  
 his own body? therefore let us hearken  
 the Priests ... how noble how admira-  
 ble is that thing, which is granted unto  
 us ... he has given us, his own flesh  
 &c. He also sayes thus: (Hom:  
 33) Let us believe God, let us not contra-  
 dict him, altho' what he sayes, may seem  
 strange to our sense & imagination,  
 for it surpasses our sense & reason. I  
 beseech you, what may we suppose of his

I

words

words in all things, chiefly in mysteries not only considering these things, which layes before us, but also his words, for we cannot be deceiv'd by them, but our senses may easilie be deceiv'd: his words cannot be false . . . . therefore because he said this is my body, let us be convinc'd by noe ambiguity, but let us believe, & perceive this, with the eyes of our understanding . . . O how many now sayes! I wou'd faine see his face, & countenance, I wou'd wish to see his garments; . . . . therefore you see him, you feele him, you eat him, you desire to see his garmets, truly he deliver'd himself to you, not only that you may see him, but also that you may touch him, & intertain him, in yourself. In his 3. book de sacerdotio, he sayes thus: he that sits above with his

Fashion

# Jennings Challenge

IN

Father, even in the same instant of time, is touch'd by the hands of all, & gives himself to all those, who are willing to receive him . . . whereas Christ leaving his flesh to us, yet ascending to heaven, there also he hath it. More of St. Chrysostom's Authorities (plainly confirmig the same) may be seen in his 8. Hom. on Matt. 45th. on John. 3 on St. Paul's Epist. to the Ephes. in his 2. to those of Antioch, and in his 6th. book de Sacerdotio. St. Augustin (who liv'd the year 420) expounding that of the 33. Psal. he was carri'd in his own hands: puts the question inquiring, how can these words be understood; & answers sayig thus: we cannot find this in David according to the litteral sense; but we may

la

sub

*find it in Christ; for Christ was carri'd in his own hands, when giving his own body, he said, this is my body, for then he carri'd that body in his own hands. In his 1. book contra aduersa. legis et Prophet. c. 9 he sayes, the following words: we receive the Mediator of God & man Iesus Christ, with a full heart & mouth, giving us, his own flesh & blood, to be eaten & dranke. Here the Reader may take notice of the word mouth, that thereby he may understand S. Augustin to have openly declar'd, that we do not receive the flesh & blood of Christ, in figure, and by faith only (as my aduersary believes) which may be further confirm'd, by S. Augustin's own words, in his 2. ser. de ver-*  
*bit*



his Apostoli, where he sayes thus: we understand the true master, divine redeemer, kīd Saviour, recommending unto us our price his own blood, for he spoke of his own body & blood. More of S. Augustin's, Authorities (proving the Real presence) may be seen, in his 11th. 26th. 27th. & 31 Treatise in John. in his commentary on the 98th. psal. in his 2. book against Petiliās letters. in his 17th. book of the City of God, c. 20. In his 3. book of the Trinity c. 4. & 10. in his 3. book super Leviticum, q. 57. In his 2. ser. de Temp. and in several other places, which would be too tedious to produce here: therefore I will conclude only, with the two following Authorities: S. Cyrill of Alexandria, who

liv'd in the year 430. in his Epist. to Nestor, w hich Epist. was aprov'd of, by the Fathers of the General Council of Ephesus) sayes thus: so immediately we come to the mystical blessings, & we are sanctifi'd, being partakers of the holy body, & precious blood of Christ, the Redeemer of us all, not taking it to be, common flesh (God forbid). . . . But made the proper flesh of the word himself: that is to say of the son of God. It was defin'd in the 18. Can. of the first General Council of Nice, That Deacons, who have no power to offer sacrifice, ought not to give the body & blood of Christ to Priests, who have that power. All which proofs, do evidently make-out, that it was alwayes believ'd (i the Primitive Church

Church) that Christ's body and blood, were really and substantially present in the holy sacrament and consequently that our Saviour had no mystical, or figurative meaning, in the institution of this sacrament. So that it is to be admir'd, what pretence can my adversary alledge, for denying the real presence, If he has not a mind to deny all mysteries, that surpasses, his own weak understanding; if so, he may by the same rule, Presume to deny that of the blessed Trinity Incarnation, Resurrectiō &c. for they surpass his understanding and capacity, as well as this of the real presence.

*Chap. 6 Proving that the holy Eucharist was ador'd, & worshipp'd*

*by those of the Primitive Church.*

If it was lawfull to fall down and worship our Saviour Jesus Christ with Godly honour, when he was in this world, tis also lawfull to fall down and worship the holy Eucharist with Godly honour, but it was lawfull to fall down & worship our Saviour Jesus Christ with Godly honour, when he was in this world, therefore tis lawfull to fall down & worship the holy Eucharist with Godly honour. The consequence is most certain, as we shall see hereafter, and the minor is manifest Mat. 6.2 v. 11. 6.14. v. 33. Jo. 6.9 v. 38. as for The major it may be prov'd thus: the same Saviour Jesus Christ, who was worship'd

In this world is really & substantially present in the holy Sacrament, as I have prov'd in my answer to the adversaries 5th. point, and will confirm it, in my answer to his 7th, therefore if it was lawfull to fall-down, and worship our Saviour Iesus Christ, with Godly honour whē he was in this world; tis also lawfull to fall-down, and worship the holy Eucharist with Godly honour. Tho' the aforesaid argument might be a sufficient answer to this point. yet I will produce the following Authorities, to confirm the same. St. Denis the Areopagite (who liv'd in the Apostles time, in his book de Eccles. Hier. c. 3) makes mention, of the *Incense of the altar*,  
of

of the Priest washing his hands, of  
 elevation of the blessed Host, of  
 the adoration thereof. Origines (who  
 liv'd in the 3. Cēturie in his 3. Homily  
 in Exod.) sayes thus: I design to  
 admonish ye, with the examples of  
 own religion: ye know who are accus'd  
 w'd so be present at the divine  
 mysteries, when ye receive the Lords  
 body, how with all caution and  
 veneration, ye take heed, least a  
 smal particle of it, should fall down,  
 any thing of the consecrated gift should  
 slip out: for ye believe your selves, to be  
 guilty, (and ye rightly believe) if  
 any thing of it wou'd fall by your negligē  
 ce. St Ambrose (who liv'd in the  
 4th. Century, in his 3. book of the  
 Holy Ghost c. 12. expounding  
 of the 98. Psal: where we

. of bid to worship the footstool of his  
 & (see) sayes thus: therefore by the foot-  
 (which, the earth, is understood, and by  
 the earth, the flesh of Christ, which,  
 also evē at this day, we adore in myste-  
 ries, and which the Apostles ador'd in  
 the Lord Jesus. S. Chrysostome (who  
 liv'd in the 4. Century, in his  
 hom. on S Pau's Epist. to the E-  
 phesians.] sayes thus: we speake of the  
 body, and of him, who differs nothing  
 from it, how many are made partakers  
 of that body? how many tastes of his  
 blood? remember that it is the body, &  
 blood of him, who resides above the  
 heavens, who is humbly ador'd by the  
 angels. He also sayes the follo-  
 wing words (hom. 24th. on St.  
 Pauls first Epist. to the Corinthi-  
 ans) the wisemen regarded this body  
 laying

laying in the manger, the impious  
barbarous men, having left their  
treasures & home, & made along voy  
& when they arriv'd, with great  
& trembling they worshipp'd  
let us therefore the Citizens of hea  
v'n imitate the barbarous people...  
do not see him in the manger, but on  
the altar, not a woman keeping him,  
the Priest holding him... let us ther  
fore weaken our selves, and be great  
afraid, let us shew a great deal more  
reverence, than these barbarous people  
for open the gates of heaven, and let  
and then you will see, that which  
said to be true; for that which is the  
most precious, and most to be ador'd  
as it thinks, I do shew you the same  
on earth; even as, in a Kings palace  
that which is most magnificent of  
things,



# Jennings Challenge

131

at the walls, nor the golden roof,  
the Kings body sitting in the throne,  
that you may see now on earth,  
I don't shew you the Angels, Ar-  
gels, or the heaves, but their master;  
I have perceiv'd, how you see on the  
earth, that which is most excellent, &  
most to be regarded of all things, nei-  
ther do you only see him, but also you  
touch him, & you eat him, & after you  
eat him, you return home; clean & pu-  
re your soul, & prepare your mind  
against the receiving of these mysteries;  
as if a King's son with a neat, & pre-  
cious crown had been given to you to  
be carri'd, you wou'd slight all the things  
of the world; but now receiving, not  
the son of a worldly King, but the only  
begotten son of God &c. St. Augustin  
who liv'd in the beginning of the  
5th

5th. Century, expounding the  
 Pfal) sayes that the earth, is  
 Lords footstool, according to the  
 of Iſaiah c 66 v. 1. laying the  
 she heaven is my throne, & the earth  
 is my footstool, and he inquires how  
 is it lawfull to adore the earth  
 with-out impiety: and then  
 sayes the following words: be-  
 troubl'd in mind I do turn myself  
 Christ, because I do seeke him & I find  
 how the earth is ador'd, with-out im-  
 piety, the footstool of his feet is ador'd  
 for he receiv'd earth from the earth, be-  
 cause the flesh is of the earth & he re-  
 ceiv'd flesh from the flesh of Man  
 & because he walk'd herein that flesh  
 & gave us the same flesh to eat for  
 our safety, none eats of that flesh  
 if he adores it not before; tis found-out

after

*What manner such a footstool of  
Lord may be ador'd, how not only,  
we do not sin in adoring it, but  
we sin, in not adoring it. More  
Augustin's Authorities may  
be seen (to the same purpose) in  
his 8. Epist. c. 3. and in his 120  
Epist. c. 27. which I omit to produ-  
ce, at least, I shu'd be too trouble-  
some to the reader.*

*up. 7 Proving that Transubstantia-  
tion was believ'd by those of the Primi-  
tive Church.*

*I shall only here enlarge those  
texts of scripture, produc'd in my  
answer to the 5th. point, with the  
following Authorities of the  
Holy Father and Doctors of the  
Primitive Church. Tertullian  
(who*

who liv'd in the begining of the  
 3. Century in his 4. book again  
 Marcian c. 40) sayes thus: *the*  
*bread taken and distributed to his*  
*disciples, he made his own body:* St. Ju  
 martyr, and S. Ireneus; who bo  
 liv'd before Tertullia do affir  
 the same: as the reader may see  
 their Authorities produc'd  
 my answer to the 5. point. S:  
 prian (who liv'd the year 150  
 his sermon of the Lord's sup  
 sayes thus: *the bread which our*  
*gave to his Disciples, being chang*  
*not in shape, but in nature: by the*  
*omnipotency of the word, was made*  
 S. Cyrill of Jerusalem (who liv  
 in the 4. Century speaking  
 Christ in his 4. Catech.) sayes  
 followig words: *he did once in*  
*of Galile*

# Jnningt Challenge 133

f... alelee, only by his will, turn water  
 into wine, which is near blood; and  
 shall he not be worthy, to be believ'd  
 u? that he turn'd wine into blood  
 therefore let us receive the body and  
 blood of Christ, with all assurance, for  
 under the shape of bread the body is  
 given to you, and under the shape of  
 wine the blood is given... therefore  
 us not consider it, as bare bread,  
 and bare wine; for it is the body and  
 blood of Christ, according to the Lord's  
 words: for altho' your sense wou'd  
 represent this to you; nevertheless  
 faith confirm you: you ought not to  
 judge these things by the taste... there,  
 knowing this & with all certain-  
 holding, the bread which is seen  
 us, not to be bread (altho' the taste  
 receives it to be bread) but to be the bo-

K

dy of

of Christ, & the wine which is seen by  
alioho' it may seem to the pallas  
be wine: notwithstanding it is not wine  
but the blood of Christ. Let the Re  
der be Pleas'd to take notice he  
plainly St Cyprian affirms, (by  
former words) that the substance  
of the bread & wine is dissolved  
at the intrance of Christ's bo  
and blood: and also how St. Cy  
bids us not to judge of this my  
rie according to the apprehension  
of our senses, but to firmly belie  
ve the true and real presence  
of Christ's body and blood under  
the shape of bread, and wine  
that is to say under the accidents  
which the bread and wine had  
before their substance was chan  
g'd. St. Gregorie Nyssen, (wh

liv'd the year 380. in his Oration  
 term'd Catechetica c. 370.) sayes  
 thus: *I do also now rightly believe the  
 sanctifi'd bread to be chang'd into the  
 body of Christ... and these things he  
 bestows transelementing the things that  
 are seen, into it, by the vertue of his  
 blessings. which words do plainly  
 make-out, that St. Gregorie posi-  
 tively believ'd the Transubstan-  
 tiation, otherwise he wou'd not  
 have said these words. St Ambro-  
 se (who liv'd about the same  
 time, in his 4th. book of sacra-  
 ments c. 4th.) sayes thus: perhaps  
 you may say, my bread is ordinary, but  
 the bread is bread before the words of  
 consecration, but when consecration  
 comes it is the flesh of Christ. a no-  
 ther convincing Authority of St.*

132      An Answer to Mr.

Ambrose may be seē in my answer to the 5th. point St. Gaudentius (who also liv'd in the 4th. age in his 2. Treatise on Exod.) sayes the following words: the Creator and Lord of natures, who brought forth the bread out of the earth, and again of the bread (because he can do it, & promis'd it) made his proper body: and of the water made wine, made of the wine his own blood. S. Chrysostome (who liv'd in the year 398. in his 83. hom. on S. Matt. speaking of this mysterie) sayes thus: these are not the works of human power which the Lord perform'd in the supper, the same also offers now the sacrifice he performs, we enjoy the office of ministers: truly tis he, who sanctifies, and changes these things. As soon



(in his Homily of the Eucharist in I neany) he also sayes the following words: do you see the bread? do you see the wine? do they go like other meat to the privy? (the Lord forbid) you ought not to imagin so: for evens after wax is apply'd to the fire... nothing of the substance remains... even so, consider here the mysteries, the substance of the body to be consum'd: that is to say, that the breads substance is annihilated, when Christ's body inters under those accidents, which formerly the bread had before it was annul'd St. Augustin [in his 18, ser. de verbe his Apostoli] sayes thus: I told ye, that the bread which is offer'd is call'd bread, before the words of Christ: but as soone, as Christ's words are pronoun

e'd, then it is not call'd bread, but  
it is call'd the body. And in the  
book of the Incarnatiō of Christ  
we read the following words: to  
not to be believ'd, that the substance  
of the bread, or wine remains, but that  
the bread is chang'd into Christ's  
body, and the wine into his blood &c.  
St. Cyrill of Alexandria, in his  
Epist. to Calosyrius, and Eusebi-  
us Emiffenus, Ser. de corpore Do-  
mini, do affirm the same. All which  
Authorities do evidently make  
out, the thing signifi'd by the  
word Transubstantiation (that  
is to say the real change of the  
substance of bread and wine, at  
the intrance of Christ's flesh &  
blood) to have been alwayes be-  
liev'd, and maintain'd by the holy  
Fathers.

Fathers, and Doctors of the Primitive Church; so that it plainly appears, that this Doctrine of Transubstantiation was not brought in, by the Church of Rome, either in the 6th. 7th. 8th. or 9th age; or by the Council of Latran (in the year 1215) as some of the pretended reformers do falsely alledge.

It is not worth my while to answer here the Adversary's 8th. point; for it is sufficiently answer'd by what I have produc'd in my answers to the three last points: for tis manifest, that all those, who contradicted (in the Primitive Church) the asor said Doctrine, that they were esteem'd and believ'd (by the holy Catholicke Church

Church) to have been notorious heretickes: as I will shew in the later end of this worke.

*Chap. 8. Proving the use, and veneration of Images, in the Primitive Church.*

If it be lawfull to worship other creatures, tis also lawfull to worship Images: but tis lawfull to worship other creatures: therefore tis lawfull to worship Images the major is manifest. for the same honour, which the scripture forbids to be given to the one, forbids it to be given to the other. (as I will shew hereafter) therefore if it be lawfull to worship other creatures, tis also lawfull to worship Images: whose making and putting up in Churches, is commanded

*Jennings Challenge* 143

commanded by the holy scripture:  
as evidently appears by the follow-  
ing texts (Exodus c. 25 v. 18, 19.  
22) where we read that God com-  
manded two Cherubins to be  
made of gold, which were to be  
set up on both sides of the Arke,  
before which the people were to  
pray, and promis'd that there he  
wou'd meet with Moses. we read  
also (Numb. c. 21 v. 8 and 9) that  
the Lord commanded Moses to  
make a fiery serpent, and to set it  
up, on a pole and that it shu'd  
come to passe, that if any one,  
would be bitten by a serpent, that  
he wou'd recover, when he wou'd  
looke upon the serpent of brass.  
more examples may be seen in the

involved yam as should have been  
looked upon as a

144 *An Answer to mr.*

3 book of Kings c. 6. v. 35. c. 7. v. 25. 29. and 36. c. 10. v. 19. in the 2. book of Chronicles c. 3. v. 10 and 14. where we read that Salomon caus'd, (at several times) Images to be made, but we can never find out, that ever he was reprehended for so doing.

Now let us see is it lawfull to worship other creatures, that thereby the minor may be prov'd. Lot seeing the Angels, *bowed himself with his face towards the ground.* Gen. c. 19. v. 1. Balaam did the same, seeing the Angel of the Lord, Numb. c. 22 v. 31. and also Joshua as may be seen Joshua c. 5. v. 14. Saul seeing the soul of Samuel, *stoop'd with his face towards the ground and bowed himself:* as may be seen in the first book

*Jennings Challenge* 145

book of Kings c. 28 v. 14. and  
(in the 3. book of Kings .c 18 v 7.)  
we read, that Abadiah fell on his  
face, and worshipp'd Elyah. *The*  
*sons of the Prophets seeing Elisha, they*  
*came to meet him, and bowed them-*  
*selves to the ground before him: as*  
may be seen in the 4th book of  
Kings c. 2. v. 15. we also read  
in the 2. c. v. 46. of Daniel, that  
the King Nebuchad-nezzar fell upon  
his face, and worshipp'd Daniel, and  
commanded that they shu'd offer an  
oblation, and sweetodours unto him.  
Christ approv'd of the making,  
and exalting of the brazen ser-  
pent, and owens it to have been  
the type and figure of himself  
exalted on the crosse, John c. 3  
v 14. S. Iohn the Baptist wor-  
shipp'd

worshipp'd the very latchet of  
our Saviours shooe. *the latchet of  
whose shooes* (saith he) *I am not worthy  
to unloose:* John. c. i. v. 27. for which  
fact St Augustin on that place,  
concludes him to have been full  
of the holy Ghost. the Patriarch  
Jacob ador'd, the top of Joseph's  
rod (a signe, or Image of his re-  
gal power) as we read in S Pauls  
Epist to the Hebrews c. i. v. 21. the  
Primitive Christians venerated  
the very shadow, and garments  
of s Peter and Paul, and receiv'd  
thereby speciall benefit: as may  
be seen in the acts of the Apostles  
c. 5. v. 15. and c. 19 v. 11. and St  
Paul in his Epist. to the Philippi-  
ans c. 2. v. 10. commands us to ho-  
nour the name of Iesus, which is  
only



only a sign, or Image of our redemption: as the name Iehova is of our creation, which was in so great honour, with the Jewes that the common people durst not utter it: no! nor the very Priests, but only in the time of sacrifice, and solemne benediction: as Philo relates, writing the life of Moses, say the very plate on which the name of God was written, on the high Priest's forehead, is call'd, *the plate of sacred veneration*, Exodus 28. v 36. 38. and we read in the 22. c. v 26 of Ezekiel, that God commanded the temple (which was an Image of his heavenly house) to be honour'd as a holy place, and reprehended those Priest's, who polluted it, saying  
thus:

thus: her Priests have violated my law; and have prophaned mine holy things; they have put no difference between the holy and prophane.

Now let us see did those of the Primitive Church, ever use or worship Images. Tertulian (who liv'd in the 3<sup>d</sup> age, in his 2<sup>d</sup> book de Pudici.) affirms, that the Image of Christ bearing a lambe on his shoulders, was graven on the chalices us'd in Churches, St, Gregory Nysen (who liv'd in the 4<sup>th</sup>. Century, in his Oration of Theodorus) sayes: that the silent picture painted on the wall doth declare several things, and that it is very profitable, this same holy Father, was wont to weep contemplating the Image of Abraham sacrificizing his son Isaac: as himself

himself testifies, in his ser. preach-  
'd in Constantinople. S. Basil (who  
liv'd in the same Century, in his  
Epist. to Julian the Emperour)  
after numbering several points  
of faith, which himself believ'd;  
brings in, the Apostles, Pro-  
phets, and Martyrs, & then con-  
cludes saying thus: *the characters of  
their Images, I do honour and worship,*  
*chiefly being this was deliver'd by the*  
*Apostles, and not prohibited: and why*  
*shu'd it not be shew'd, painted in all*  
*our Churches.* & in his ser. of Barlaam,  
he also sayes, the followig Words:  
*ye famous painters raise up and ex-*  
*toll your arts in painting this saint's*  
*Image... and likewise let Christ's I-*  
*mage be painted* St. Hierome (who  
liv'd in the year 390. writing the  
*life*

life of Paula) sayes, that shee was  
wont to prostrate herself before the cr  
oifix, and ador'd it as if shee had be  
held the Lord crucifi'd before her eyes. S.  
Crisostome (in his ser. quod ve  
teris et novi Testamenti unus in  
Legislator) declar'd, that himself  
lov'd a picture of melted wax full of  
piety, and (in his Liturgy) he sayes,  
that the Priest was wont to bow down  
his head before the Image of Christ  
he makes also mention of Christs  
Image in his ser. de feria quinta  
Cena Domini Paladius (who liv'd  
in the same time, in his 11th. E  
pist.) relates, that the Bishop of Jeru  
salem was wont yearly, at the solemnity  
of Easter, to expose the crosse, to be a  
dor'd by the people, he himself first a  
doring it. St. Cyrill of Alexandria

(who

Jennings Challenge 151

(who liv'd in the 5 Century, in his homily against Nestor) sayes thus: hail mother of God... through whom the precious crosse is made famous, and ador'd throughout the world. Cælius Sedulius (who also liv'd in the 5 Century, in his 5th book) sayes the following words: neither is there any, who dose not know, that the Image of the crosse ought to be worshipp'd. S. Gregorie (who liv'd in the same Century, in his 7 book Epist. 5) bids the Bishop Januarus, to take the crucifix and the Image of the blessed virgin from the Jewes, who did not give them the due veneration. And in his 53 Epist. (which is to Secundinus) he sayes thus: I do know that you long for our Saviour's Image, that by contemplating it, you might  
L
burn

*burn the more with the love of the Lord.*  
Eusebius (writing the life of  
Constant the great,) relates, that  
agreat many of Golden, and Sil-  
ver Images were put up in the  
Churches, which he caus'd to be  
built, in Palestine, & in his 7. booke.  
c. 14. he affirms himself to ha-  
ve seē the Apostles Images, which  
then were very old, and in great  
veneration with the people. Da-  
mas relates (writing the life  
of St. Sylvester) that the afore-  
said Constantine commanded an  
Image of pure Gold to be made,  
which he order'd to be put up in  
the Church, wherein he was bap-  
tiz'd, on the right hand of which,  
he plac'd the Image of our Savi-  
our, and on the left hand, the  
Image

Image of St. John the Baptist; he also order'd the Image of our Saviour, of four Angels, and of the twelve Apostles, to be put up in the Church of St. John Latran, in Rome, in order to be venerated by the Christians. Evodius (in his book writing of S. Stephen's miracles), sayes that his Image was put up in the same Church wherein his reliques were preserv'd, and that a great multitude of people were us'd to frequent that Church, out of particular devotion, who venerated both the Image & his reliques. The Disciples of S. Epiphanius, plac'd his Image in the Church which they built in his honour, and were wont to pray most reverently before

fore the same Image: as the Fathers of the 7th General Council do declare, in the 6th. Action. St. Ambrose (in his Oration of Theodosius's death, saies that it was discreetly done of Helena to order the crosse (where upon our Saviour was crucifi'd) to be taken up out of the ground (where the Jewes absconded it, that it might be worshipp'd by the Christians: and (in his Epist. de invention sanctorum Gervasy et Protasij) he declares, that he knew him, who appear'd to himself, to be S. Paul, by his Image, which he had before. S. Augustin (in his first book de Consensu Evangelistarum) affirms, himself to have seen in several places Christ's Image, painted



Painted betwen S. Peter and St. Paul's Images: and (in his 3th. book of the Trinity c. 10. in his 2. de Doct. Christ. c. 25. and also in his 3. book c. 9) he sayes, that Images are very profitable, in order to move the people to devotion. Metaphrastes (in the life of Constantine the great) Euagrius (in his 4th. book c. 26) and Damascenus (in his first book de Imaginibus) do relate, that a painter endeavoring to draw the Image of Christ, whose splendour when he cou'd not behold, our Saviour himself tooke apeece of white linnen and laying it on his face, imprinted there-on the Image of his divine countenance, and after-wards sent it to King

L:                      Abagarus

Abagarus, who long'd to see our Saviour, which Image after a while (out of of particular veneration) was brought by Philip the General of Mauritius's army unto the field, and gain'd thereby a most glorious victory from the Persians: as Theophanes relates in his 17th. book. Marianus Scotus in his Cronicles. (writing of the 39 year) makes mention of an other Image painted after the same manner by our Saviour, in a handkerchief offer'd to him (by a devout woman call'd Veronica) as he sweated carrying the crosse to mount Calvary, which Image in the reign of Tiberius the Emperour, was brought to Rome, and there honourably reserved.

serv'd, and shew'd to the people every munday and thursday. Several other Images of Christ, were made even by those who liv'd in his one time: as for example, there was one made by the woman whom he heal'd of the bloody flux, which was set up in the city Penades, where several miracles were wrought upon the account of it: as Eusebius (in his 7. book c. 14th ) Sozomenus (in his 5th. book c. 20 ) and Damascenus (in his first book de Imaginibus) do relate, for a certain herbe which grew at the foot of that Image, when it came to be so high that it cou'd touch the hem of the Image, it receiv'd vertue to heal all kind of distempers, and (as Sozo-

Sozomenus testifies, when Julius the Emprour order'd to fall down, and to place his own Image in stead of it, his was immediately consum'd by fire from heaven, which miracle the Pagans seeing, most impiously (by the instinct of the diuel) brake our Saviours Image, not considering, that he who caus'd their Emprours Image to be burn'd, might by the same power, cause also fire to come down from heaven, in order to burn both themselves and thier Emprour too, only that his divine goodness and clemency had more patience to expect their conversion, of which the Emprours Image was incapable, an other Image of Christ was made

by

by Nicodemus; which a Christian  
(43. years after it was made)  
carri'd from Jerusalem to Berith  
Village in Syria, where (in de-  
nison of our Saviour's Passion) it  
was by the Jewes crown'd whip-  
p'd, pierc'd, &c. & v'l'd it with all  
manner of villany as they us'd  
our Saviour himself; but not with  
out great miracle, for as they  
pierc'd it, there issu'd out of it,  
abundance of water and blood:  
by which divers maladyes were  
cur'd, and several Jewes conver-  
ted, seeing these miracles: as A-  
thanasius (in his book de Passione  
Imaginis Domini c. 4th.) and  
Gregorie of Tours. (de gloria  
martyrum c. 21.) do relate. To  
which examples may be also ad-  
ded

ded those Images of our blessed Lady; one made by S. Luke which is to be seen at this very day in the Church of Loretta in Italy; and an other of her which Eudoxia sent from Jerusalem to Pulcheria, which she plac'd near her own seat in the Church, that shee built in Constantinople: as Nicephorus writes (in his 14th. book c. 2.) might Produce several other Images, which were made & worshipp'd by those of the Primitive Church, If I had not supposed that any impartial reader might plainly perceivē (by what I have already produc'd) that the use of Images is no new Doctrine of the holy Catholick Church,

consequently that their worship  
and veneration, is not prohibited  
by the second commandment,  
(as my adversary and his adhe-  
rence do falsely teach) for that  
which is prohibited by this com-  
mandment, and also by the scrip-  
ture in several places, is to wor-  
ship, or adore any creature with  
that honour, which is due to the  
Almighty God: as formerly the  
Gentiles did, when they made I-  
dols and false Gods; which after-  
wards they worshipp'd and ador'd  
even as if every one of them had  
been a true, and an Eternal God:  
wherefore they are alwayes be-  
lier'd by those of the Church of  
Rome to have been Idolators, &  
impious for soe doing; which  
they

they wou'd not judge, if themselves were guilty of the same crime, or of any other of that kind: therefore the worship which is peculiar to God is commonly call'd by the divines, *Cultus Latriæ*, that is to say, a sovereign honour, and the Church of Rome most strictly forbids all her members, to give it to any creature: therefore the honour & veneration, which she allows to be given, to Images, is not that of *Latria*, or *Leveraigne*, as all the Fathers of the 7th. General Council do declare (in the 7th. Action) but it is an inferior kind of veneration call'd *relative*, that is to say, that they are worshipp'd, in as much as they represent unto us Godly things



and are instruments apt to move  
the people to thinke of what our  
Saviour & the Saints have  
suffer'd & done in this world, so  
that they serve in a manner as books  
to those who cannot read, & excite  
the people to great devotion,  
& piety, which otherwise wou'd  
not have enter'd into their tho-  
ughts nor imaginations: so that  
the reader may take notice, how  
uncharitable the pretended re-  
formers do continually preach to  
their poor ignorant flock, that the  
Papists are Idolators and impi-  
ous, by worshipping graven im-  
ages, as Gods: that thereby  
they might render the holy Ca-  
tholick Church odious and abo-  
minable, to the very simple peo-  
ple

ple, fearing that any of them  
wou'd embrace her principles,  
offer to find out the real verity  
of her uncorrupted doctrine.

Chap. 9 Proving the invocation  
Angels, and Saints to be lawfull  
practis'd by those of the Primitive  
Church

The Angels, and Saints are  
a special care of us, and we receive  
several benefits by their as-  
sistance and merits: therefore  
is lawfull to invoke them, that  
they may interceed for us to God  
the antecedent is manifest by the  
following texts. And the Angel  
of God call'd to Hagar out of heaven  
and said unto her, what aileth thee  
Hagar? fear not: for God hath heard  
the voice of the child. Genesis

# Jennings Challenge 169

17. and the Angel of the Lord call'd  
unto him out of heaven and said Abra-  
ham, Abraham; lay not thine hand up-  
on the child; neither do thou any thing  
unto him; for I know that thou fearest  
God. Genesis c. 22. v. 11. 12. The An-  
gel which redeem'd me from all evil  
blessed these boys. Genesis c. 48. v.  
16. Then the Angel of the Lord went for-  
th & smote in the camp of the Affy-  
rians an hundred and four score & five  
thousand. Ilaiah c. 37. v. 36. Then  
the Angel of the Lord Answer'd &  
said O Lord of hosts! how long wilt  
thou not have mercy in Jerusalem, and  
in the cities of Judah, against which  
thou hast indignation these threescore  
and ten years. Zechariah c. 1. v. 12.  
Michael one of the Princes, come to help  
me: there is none that holdeth with me

in these things, but Michael Daniel  
 10. v. 13. & 21. But while he thought  
 these things, behol'd, the Angel of the  
 Lord appear'd unto him in a dream,  
 saying, Ioseph son of David, fear not to  
 take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that  
 which is conceiv'd in her is of the holy  
 Ghost. Matt. c. 1. v. 20. Take heed that  
 ye despise not one of these little ones  
 for I say unto ye that in heaven their  
 Angels do alwayes behold the face of  
 my Father, which is in heaven. Matt.  
 c. 18. v. 10. And four & twenty el-  
 ders fell down before the lambe having  
 every one of them harps and golden  
 vials full of odours, which are the pray-  
 ers of the Saints. Revelations, c. 5. v.  
 8. and c. 8. v. 3. & 4. and another  
 Angel came & stood at the altar, hav-  
 ing a golden censur, & there was  
 given

# Jennings Challenge 167

given unto him much incense, that he  
 should offer it with the prayers of all  
 saints upon the golden Altar, which  
 was before the throne: & the smoake  
 of the incense which came with the  
 prayers of the Saints ascended up be-  
 fore God out of the Angels hands. We  
 read in the 2. book of the Macca-  
 bees c. 15. that Judas Machabeus  
 had seen Onias the high Priest  
 and Jeremiah the Prophet (after  
 their death) interceding to God  
 for the people of Israel, and that  
 this book is Canonical I will pro-  
 ve in my answer to the next po-  
 int.) we read also in the 15 c. v. c. of  
 Jeremiah that the Lord spoke unto  
 him saying thus: Tho' Moses and Sa-  
 muel stood before me, yet my minde  
 would not be towards this people cast

M

them

*them out of my sight, and let them go forth:* which words our Lord would not have said; If Moses Samuel (tho' dead) were not wont to interced for the Jewes: which may be confirm'd out of Exodus 6. 32 v. 13. where we read that Moses himself beg'd of the Lord to shew his mercy to the people for the sake of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, his own servants. for (as Theodor et q. 67. on Exodus says) Moses thinking himself insufficient to pacifie the Lord he sets down not only his own promise, but also the aforesaid Patriarchs merits, that thereby the Lord might be more willing to have commiseration upon the people, and pardon them, who

then he did: as is manifest by the  
14. v. of the same *chap.* Moses also  
endeavour'd an other time to pa-  
cifie the Lord's fury thro' the  
aforſaid Patriarchs merits, & aſſi-  
ſtance: as is evident out of Deut.  
9. v. 27 wherre he ſayes thus:  
*remember they ſervants Abraham, Iſaac,*  
*and Jacob: looke not unto the ſtoubborn-*  
*neſs of this people, nor to their wicked-*  
*neſs, nor to their ſinne.*

Was it not for the ſake of Abra-  
ham (tho' dead) his ſon Iſaac ob-  
tain'd ſeveral requests & favours  
from the Lord? *Genesis c. 26. v.*  
*2. 4. 5. & 24.* wou'd not the Lord  
divide Salomon's Kindom, & give  
it to his ſervants? If it had not  
been for the ſake of David: as  
may be ſeen in the 3 book of Kings

2. 11. v. 17. 12. was it not for the sake of David Abyas obtain'd? that his son Afa reign'd in Jerusalem: as may be seen in the same book c. 15. v. 4. was it not also for the sake of David (tho' dead) the Lord fav'd the city of Jerusalem from being destroy'd by the Assyrians: as is evident out of the 4th. book of Kings c. 19. v. 32. & 34. & c. 20. v. 6. when Salomon beg'd any great request from the Lord, was not he wont, to set down the merits of David? that thereby he might the sooner obtain his request; as may be seen in the 131. Psalm. v. 1. 10. which is in the Protestant bible the 132. Psalm.

Now let the reader consider what a great happiness it is to ha-



ve a faithfull friend and Patron  
in great honour and request with  
God almighty thro' whose merits  
and intercession, one may obtain  
several benefits, which otherwise  
wou'd not be granted: as the pre-  
misses do evidently make-out, for  
as God almighty was graciously  
pleas'd (thro' the bountifullnesse  
of his infinite mercy) to grant  
for the merits and intercession of  
these Patriarches, (who then we-  
re but in Limbo Patrum) so many  
benefits and requests, to those  
whom they protected in this world  
why also now in the law of grace  
wou'd not the same God (most  
mercifully) grant us any lawfull  
request? for the intercession and  
great merits of his holy Mother,

M<sub>3</sub>

beloved

beloved Apostles, faithfull Martyres, and true Confessors, who are in great honour and request, residing with himself in heavens. Especially being this dose not derogate to the honour of Christ, as I will prove by the following passage.

If it be unlawfull to invoke Angel, & Saints either it is because they know not what we say: or because it wou'd derogate to the honour of Christ, who is said to be the mediator betwen God & man, according to that of John in his first Epist. c. 2. v. 1. not for the first, as I have already shew'd and shall confirm it by the following examples. We read in the 4th. book of Kings c. 5.

v. 16,

v. 26 that Elisha knew (tho' absēt)  
 Gehazie's Simonie: and (in the  
 6th. v. 12.) that Elisha also knew  
 what was said in the King of Sy-  
 ria's private Chamber: & (in the  
 19th. c. v. 10. of Luke) that the  
 Angels of God doth rejoyce at  
 the conversion of a sinner, which  
 is the greatest secret that one  
 can have; yet it can be known  
 to the Angels, and also to the  
 Saints in heaven: either by a dis-  
 tinct revelation from the clear  
 vision of God's essence, or by the  
 visiō of themselves: as S. Grego-  
 rie (in his 1. book of Dialogues  
 c. 3.) affirms saying thus: *what*  
*is it, that there they know not? where*  
*they know him who knowes all.*

Neither dose it derogate to the  
 honour

honour of Christ, for the Church of Rome certainly believes, Christ to be the chief Mediator between God and man: as St Paul affirms, (in his Epist to Timothy 6. 2. v. 5.) therefore she dose not allow to invoke Angels or Saints in order to obtain any request immediatly and directly from themselves, for she acknowledges that to be a folly, & consequently not to be in their power. So that she only allows to beg of them to join their prayers, & intercessiō with those of the faithful, that thereby they might the sooner & easier obtain from God their requests, thro' the merits and intercession of Jesus Christ, which is manifest out of

St.

honour

Leo's 2 Oration de Jejunio,  
and also by the publick Oration  
of the Church, wherein she im-  
plores the intercession of Angels  
and Saints: for she wou'd have  
them to be efficacious thro' the  
assistance and merits of Christ; it  
is therefore they alwayes end  
with the following words: *Per Do-  
minum nostrum Jesum Christum Filium  
unum, qui tecum vivit, et regnat in  
unitate spiritus sancti, Deus per omnia  
secula seculorum Amen.* whereby the  
reader may plainly perceive, that  
the invocations of Saints dose  
not derogate to the honour of  
Christ: otherwise St Paul might  
be accus'd for beseeching the  
Romans Colossians, Hebrews, &  
Thessalonians, to assist himself in  
his

his prayers, and also to pray for him to God: as is evident by St Paul's own Epistles: to the Romans 6, 15 v. 30. to the Hebrews 6. 13. v. 18. 19. to the Colossians 6. 4. v. 3. in his first and second to the Thessalonians 1. 5 v. 25. 6. 3. v. 1 so that the Adversary must either Confess the invocation of Saints not to derogate Christ's honour; or else to condemn St Paul's Doctrine: for I defie him ever to make-out that the intercession of those, who live in this world, is acceptable to God, & not the intercession of those, who are cōfirm'd in grace & glory: or that one is prejudice to Christ & the other not

Now let us heare the holy Fathers Autho

for  
 Se  
 Ro-  
 ew  
 and  
 ond  
 3.  
 uft  
 on  
 ft's  
 Se  
 him  
 er-  
 his  
 &  
 ho  
 or  
 &  
 2-  
 ho

Authorityes and the practice of  
 the Primitive Church. St. Irenæ-  
 us (who liv'd in the 2 Century, in  
 his 5th book against hereses) sayes  
 thus: *and as Eve was seduc'd that*  
*she might avoid God: even so, Mary*  
*was advis'd to obey God that she might*  
*become Eves advocate* Origenes (who  
 liv'd in the 3 Century, in his first  
 homily on Ezech:) sayes thus-  
*some Angel and receive the converted*  
*from the former error, from the devilish*  
*doctrine ... call the rest of your compa-*  
*nions that ye may together instruct*  
*in the faith, all those who formerly has*  
*been deceiv'd: more of Origen's Au-*  
 thorityes may be seen hom. 3. in  
 Diversa Loca Novi Testamenti  
 hom. 16. in Josue, and hom. 26. in  
 Nume. Cornelius (who liv'd  
 in

in the same century, in his first Epistle, sayes thus: we are Praying God, & our Lord Jesus Christ that by the intercessions of his own holy Apostles, he may purge out the blemishes of your finnes. St. Cyprian (who also liv'd in the 3. Century, in his book de Disiplina, et Habitu Virginum speaking to the Virgins) sayes thus: perform (spiritually) come prosperously, and be mindfull of us. Eusebius Cæs. (who liv'd the year 326. in his 13. book de Evang. Præp. c. 7.) sayes, we shouldiers of true piety do daily practise these things, honouring the friends of God ... & praying to them... by whose intercession to God we do freely acknowledge to be much favour'd. S. Athanasius (who liv'd in the same Century in his

b. vii. c. 10. w.)

ler.



er. in Evangelium, speaking of  
the blessed Virgin Mary) layes  
the following words; *incline they*  
*hearing to our prayers, and do not for-*  
*get they people...* we cry to thee, be  
mindfull of us most holy Virgin, who  
also after your delivery continu'd a  
Virgin... Lady & Mistress, and Queen  
and Mother of God intercede for us.  
St Hilarius (who liv'd the year  
355. in psal 119) layes that the na-  
ture of God dose not want the interce-  
ssion of Angels... God being ignorant  
of nothing that we do but our own weak-  
ness wants it: he has such an other  
Authority speaking of the Apol-  
tles, and Prophets intercession  
expounding the 114. Psalm. St.  
Basil (who liv'd in the same age,  
in his Oration of the 40. Marty-  
res)

res) sayes thus: whosoever is oppress'd with trouble, let him fly for refuge to these martyres, that he may be ridd of his troubles: and whosoever rejoyces let him Pray to them that he may continue in his prosperities. And in his 205. Epist. which is to Julian, after specifying several points of faith which himself beliv'd, he sayes the following words: and I do embrace the holy Apostles, Prophets and invoke them in my supplication to God, that by their intercession he might be mercysfull to me. S. Cyrill of Jerusalem (who liv'd about the same time, Catech. 5.) sayes thus: when we offer this sacrifice we also make mention of those who dy'd before us, first of the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Martyres, that God may receive

receive our prayer by their intercession.

S. Ephraem (who also liv'd in the same Century in his ser. de Laudibus Martyrum) sayes the following words: we beseech ye most holy Martyres, who for the sake of the Lord readily and willingly suffer'd torments for which ye are all now most familiar with God, that ye may be pleas'd to intercede to the Lord for us poor sinners, that the grace of Christ might shine upon us. St. Gregorie Nazianzen (who liv'd the year 370, in his Oration speaking to S. Athanasius after his (death) sayes thus and look upon us favorably from above and govern this holy people, nourish and feed us in peace, direct and take us up in the battel, and place us with your self and with those, who are

in

*in the same condation with you; he implores also St. Cyprian & St. Basil's assistance, in his Orations of them (after their death.) St. Ambrose (who liv'd the same time) sayes the following words: the Angels who are employ'd to assist us ought to be pray'd to, and the Martyres ... they can intercede for our sins, who wish their proper blood wash'd a way if they had any sins... let us not be ash-m'd to apply them a intercessors of our weaknes. More of this holy Doctors Authority may be seen in his 2. book de Virg. in his 10. book in Lucam, expounding the 21. e, and in his Preparation before mass, where he begs the assistance and intercession of the Apostles, Martyres & Cōfessors,*  
St.

Jennings Challenge 183

Gregorie Nylen (who liv'd  
the year 380. in his Oration of St.  
Theodor Martyr) layes thus:  
we stand in need of great favours,  
intercede and pray earnestly to the  
universal King and Lord for the Coun-  
try... for we fear afflictions, we ex-  
pect dangers, the wicked Scythians are  
not far off declaring war against us.  
I fight for us as a souldier, as a martyr  
I beseech the liberty of speaking for your fellow  
servant: altho' you have left the world  
yet you know the disposition, interest  
and necessity of human nature; beg  
that these publick assemblies  
may not give over, least the furious, wic-  
ked and barbarous Scythians would  
raise against us and assault our Church-  
es and Altars... but if it be requisite  
to have more assistance and prayers ga-

N

ther

*An Answer to mr  
 ther your comforts the Martyres, and pray  
 along with them, for the prayers of  
 many righteous doth wash away the sin  
 of many: admonish Peter, move Paul  
 and John that beloved Disciple, that  
 they may take care of those Churches  
 for whose sake they endur'd chains, suf-  
 fer'd dangers and death. S. Hierome  
 (who liv'd the year 390, in his  
 Oratio on Paula sayes thus: fear not  
 O Paula and help with your prayer  
 thy worshipper in his old age... for  
 you who is present will more easily ob-  
 tain, what you demand. S. Christo-  
 stome (who also liv'd the same  
 time, in his 45. homily, speaking  
 of St. Meletius) sayes thus: there-  
 fore let us all together men and wo-  
 men both young and old pray to holy  
 Miletus &c.*

In his ser. speaking of the blessed  
 Mary, he sayes the followig words:  
*he prayes us recurr to the most holy Virgin Mary*  
*Paul Mother of God, that by her intercession*  
*e, thou may obtain our request... we beseech*  
*arches thee to intercede for us daily to our*  
*, sus. Lord Jesus Christ thy own son, that*  
*rom thee thro' his grace and benignity*  
*n his may be pardon'd. & in his 66. hom.*  
*arned to the people of Antioch he*  
*rayes thus: he who gose in his purple*  
*.. found royal crown laying by his pride*  
*gly bows near the Saints sepulchres, humbly*  
*ariso beseeching them to intercede for him*  
*fame to God &c. More of St. Chrylostoms*  
*king Authorityes may be seen in his*  
*9th. hom. in Matt. in his ser. de*  
*herentio, and Maximio and in his*  
*1st hom. on St. Paul's first Epist.*  
*to the Thessalonians, where he*

Numbers several benefit: graced  
by the Saints intercession & thro  
their merits. S. Augustin (who  
liv'd the year 410 in his 7 book  
against the Donatists e. i. speaking  
of S. Cyprian) sayes the follo  
wing words. *we beseech him to assist*  
*us with his prayers &c.* in his 84.  
Treatise in John, he sayes, that it  
was therefore they did not pray  
for the Martyres as they did for  
other people who dy'd, because  
they knew that they did not want their  
prayers: but they wanted the Martyres  
prayers: and in his 29. Ser: of the  
Saints (speaking of St. Peter's  
Miracles) he sayes thus: *If then the*  
*shadow of his body coul'd relieve, how*  
*much more now the plenitude of his ver*  
*tie? If then a certain noise of him passing*  
*by*



prevail'd to those who beseech'd him,  
 much more to his permanent grace?  
 If the reader pleases, he may see  
 more of St. Augustin's Authorities,  
 in his 17. *ser. de Verbis Apostolicis*  
 in his 149. Q. on Exod: in his book  
*de Cura pro mortuis c. 4.* and in  
 his Commentary on the 19. c. of  
 Job, all which, (with several other  
 convincing proofs) I omit to pro-  
 duce, & will only conclude with  
 the Authority of the General  
 Council of Calcedon where 630. Fa-  
 thers sat the year 451. & earnest-  
 ly beseech'd St. Flavianus (then  
 Bishop of Constantinople) to pray  
 for themselves: as  
 manifest by the 17. Action: we  
 read in the Bishops of Eu-  
 phrasius letter to Leo the Emperour  
 which is to be seen in the later end

of this Council that they declar'd themselves to acknowledge, that holy Proterius was register'd in the Catholique of Martyres, & that they beg'd God Almighty to be favourable & mercifull to themselves thro' his intercession all which Authorities do evidently make out that the Catholicks of the Primitive Church were accusom'd to invoke Saints.

*Chap. 10 Proving that Purgatory, was believ'd by those of the Primitive Church.*

For the better intelligence of this point let the reader know, that altho' the sinners crime is forgiven, yet the sinner under goe some temporal punishment: as is manifest Numb: c. 12. v: 1. 2 10, 14;

where

where we read that when the  
sin of murmuring was forgiven  
to Mary, by Moses intercession;  
yet in punishment thereof she had  
the leprosie for the space of se-  
ven dayes, and was oblig'd to  
leave the whole camp during that  
time. When the Israelites sinn'd  
against God, and offer'd to rebel  
against Moses tho' their sinnes  
were forgiven thro' the Lord's  
infinite mercy, and by the inter-  
cession of Moses yet in punishmēt  
of their crime several of them  
dy'd in the wilderness and never  
was admitted to come to the land  
of promise Num 14. v. 19. 20,  
21. 24; 7. & also when David sin-  
n'd against the Lord his crime  
was forgiven but in punishment  
thereof;

thereof; his son dy'd the 2 book  
of Kings 6, 12 v. 13 14 15. finally  
we read in St Paul's first Epistle  
to the Corinthians, 11 v: 30 that  
several of the Corinthians were  
mortifi'd by the Lord and also  
that some of them dy'd; because  
they receiv'd unworthily the  
holy Sacrament; but then their  
sins has been forgiven: as is evi-  
dent by the 31, v. where St. Paul  
sayes the following words: but  
when we are judg'd we are chastiz'd,  
by the Lord, that we shu'd not be con-  
demn'd. whereby the reader may  
plainly perceive that God does  
not forgive the punishment, as  
often as he forgives the sinne,  
which several times deserves  
Eternal punishment, but thro' his

book  
ally  
pist  
that  
were  
also  
ause  
the  
their  
eris  
Paul  
but  
zed,  
rou-  
may  
ose  
at  
ne,  
ves  
his  
ney

clemency and infinite mercy  
changes that eternal punishment  
into some temporal affliction,  
which if the sinner dose not un-  
dergo in this world, he must suf-  
fer for it after his death, before  
ever he shall enter into the King-  
dom of heaven, for none is re-  
ceiv'd there untill he is even as  
clean from all manner of sin, and  
fault as he was immediately after  
his Baptism, as witnesseth that of  
John 4. level: c. 21, v. 27,

This presuppos'd I may lawfully  
infern that theré must be some  
place of temporal punishment  
in order to purifie and cleanse  
those souls who doe not perform  
their penance in this world, and  
die not in a mortal sin in venial

sins, to which Eternal punishment is not due; for it wou'd be a most unreasonable thing of us to believe that he who immediatly has been in the state of grace and dyes suddenly after speaking an idle word, or committing some other small offence shu'd be oblig'd to everlasting torments, even as he who suddenly dyes without any kind of repentance after committing murder, adultery, or some other great crime: therefore being he cannot inter the into heaven by reason of that small offence he must go to some other place untill he is purifi'd which I shall prove by the following argument. what ever the old and new Testament, the holy Fathers and

Doctors of the Primitive Church,  
several Councils, true and wonderfull  
revelations, affirms; ought  
to be believ'd by all Christians:  
but the old and new Testament,  
the holy Fathers, and Doctors  
of the Primitive Church, several  
Councils, true and wonderfull  
revelation affirms that which the  
Church of Rome calls Purgatory;  
to be a place of temporal punish-  
ment wherein some souls are cha-  
stiz'd and purifi'd after leving  
this world: therefore Purgatory  
ought to be believ'd by all Chris-  
tians: the consequence is evident;  
as we shall see hereafter: and  
the major cannot be deny'd by a-  
ny true Christian: as for the min-  
or, I will prove it after the same  
order

194      *An Answer to mr.*

order, wherein it's form'd: therefore I will begin with the Authorities of the old Testament. We find in the 65 Psalm (which is the 66th. in the Protestant English Bible) v. 12 the following words: *we went thro' fire and water, but thou broughtest us out into a wealthy place* where the word water signifies Baptism, & the word fire Purgatory, as Origines hom. 15. in num. and St. Ambrose in his commentary on the 36. psalm. and also in his 3. ser. in psalm. 118. declares: *O Lord, rebuke me not in thy wrath, neither hasten me in thy hot displeasure.* psal. 38. St. Augustin (in his exposition on this text) sayes that to rebuke one in God's wrath, is the same as to condemn him perpetually



perpetual y, and to chasten one  
in his displeasure, is to punish  
him severely after this life in or-  
der to be purifi'd, and so concludes  
with the following words: O Lord  
be pleas'd to chastise me in this world...  
that I may not want that correctig fire.  
And it shall come to passe, that he that  
is left in zion, and he that remaineth  
in Jerusalem, shall be call'd holy. when  
the Lord shall have wash'd away the  
filth of the daughters of zion, & shall  
have purg'd the blood of Jerusalem  
from the midst thereof, by the spirit of  
judgment, and by the spirit of burning.  
Isaiah c. 4. v. 3. and 4. which text  
(according to St. Augustin in  
his 20th. book of the City of  
God c. 25.) means the releasment,  
which souls do get from the bur-  
ning

ning fire of Purgatory. Micah. c.  
7. v. 7. 8. and 9 I will look unto the  
Lord. I will wait for the God of my sal-  
vation: my God will heare me, rejoyce  
not against me O mine enemy when I  
fall I shall arise, when I sit in dark-  
nesse the Lord shall be light onto me. I  
will beare the indignatio of the Lord,  
because I have sinn'd against him, untill  
he plead my case, and execute judge-  
ment for me, he will bring me forth  
to the light, and I shall behold his  
righteousnesse. Which words (as St.  
Hierome affirms in his commen-  
tary on the last c. of Iſaiah) means  
the releasment of those souls who  
do suffer in Purgatory fire. Zecha-  
riah c. 9. v. 11. you also by the blood  
of they covenant have brought forth  
your prisoners out of the pit wherein  
there

there is no water. St. Peter speakig  
of those Prisoners (in his first Ep.  
c. 3. v. 18. 19 & 20,) sayes thus. for  
Christ also hath once suffer'd for sins,  
the just for the unjust (that he might  
bring us to God) being put to death in the  
flesh, but quickened by the spirit: by  
which also he went and preach'd unto  
the spirits in prison; which sometimes  
were disobedient when once the long  
suffering of God waited in the dayes  
of Noab, while the arke was a preparig.  
Malachi. c. 3. v. 3, and he shall sit  
as a refiner and a purifier of silver: and  
he shall purifie the sons of Levi, and  
purge them as gold and silver, that  
they may offer unto the Lord an offerig in  
righteousnesse. Which text signifies  
the punishment of Purgatory; as  
the following Fathers do testifies  
Origenes

Origines hom. 6. in Exod. S. Ambrose in his commentary on the 36. psal. St. Hierome in the exposition of this text, and St. Augustin in his 20th. book of the city of God c. 25. we find in the 2. book of Machabees, c. 12. v. 43. that Judas Machabeus had sent to Jerusalem twelve thousand peeces of silver to be offer'd for the souls of his souldiers, here are the very words of the scripture: *and making a gathering he sent twelve thousand draemes of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offer'd for sinne well and religiously thinking of the Resurrection for unless he hop'd that they that were slaine should raise againe, it should seeme superfluous and vaine to pray for the dead and because he confi-*  
*der'd*

consider'd that they, which had taken  
 their sleep with Godline's, had very  
 Good grace lay'd up for them. It is  
 therefore a holy and healthfull cogita-  
 tion to pray for the dead, that they may  
 be loose from sinnes. perhaps you  
 may Answer, saying that this  
 book is not the word of God, or  
 canonical, and consequently that  
 its Authority is of no force, but  
 because it wou'd not be canonical  
 itself, it ought to be sooner believ-  
 ed then either Calvin or Luthers  
 and consequently prefer'd be-  
 fore their Authorityes; being Ju-  
 das was always esteem'd to have  
 been a most faithfull servant to  
 God Almighty, and then has  
 been a high Priest of the true  
 Church. Moreover ti's false that  
 O this

this book is not Canonical, for Tradition and the Authority of the holy Catholick Church, (which is all the testimony we can produce to prove that any book of the whole Bible is canonical, or the true word of God) expressly affirms, that this book is Canonical, and consequently the word of God: as may be seen in Innocēt the first's letter to Exuperius, in St Cyprian's first book c. 3. in his book de Exhortatio Martyry; c. 11. in St. Gregorie Nazianzens Oration de Machabæis, in St. Ambrose's 2. book de Jacob c. 10. 11. 12. in St. Augustis 2. book against Gaudentius Epistles, c. 23 in his 2 book de Doc. Christ. c. 8. & in his 18. book of  
the

# Jennings Challenge

201

the City of God c. 36. and also  
in the 47 Chap. of the 3. Coun-  
cil of Carthage, celebrated the  
year 397. whose very words are  
these: *Item placuit, ut præter scrip-  
turas Canonicas nihil in Ecclesia lega-  
tur, sub nomine divinaram scriptura-  
rum. Sunt autem canonice Scripturae,  
Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri,  
Deuteronomium, Jesus naxe, Judicum  
Ruth, Regum libri quatuor, Paralipo-  
menon libri duo, Job, psalterium, Da-  
vidicum, Salomonis libri quinque,  
libri duodecim Prophetarum, Isaias,  
Jeremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, Tobias,  
Judith, Ester, Esdra libri, duo, Macha-  
bæorum libri duo, Novi autem Testa-  
menti, Evangeliorum libri quatuor,  
Actuum Apostolorum liber unus, Pauli  
Apostoli Epistolæ tredecim, ejusdem ad*

Q2

Hebræis

*Hebraeos una, Petri Apostoli dua, Joannis  
 Apostoli tres, Jude Apostoli una, et Jaco-  
 bi una, Apocalipsis Joannis liber unus.*  
 Whereby the reader may plainly  
 see that my adversary can have  
 no kind of tolerable reason to  
 reject the books of Machabees,  
 more than any other book of the  
 whole Bible; Now let us heare  
 those texts of the new Testament  
 which speaks of Purgatory Mat.  
 c. 5. v. 22 But I say unto you, that  
 whosoever is angry with his brother with-  
 out a cause shall be in danger of judgment  
 & whosoever shall say to his brother Ra,  
 cha, shall be in danger of Council: but who-  
 soever shall say thou fool shall be in  
 danger of hell fire. Which text ex-  
 pressly declares the soul to be  
 punish'd after leav'g this world.  
 for



for three several finnes; and that only for the last of them he shall suffer Eternal fire: so that I may lawfully infer, that there must be some other place wherein the souls are punish'd for the two other finnes: but that other place cannot be heaven: as is evident; neither is it hell, as the text makes out: therefore it must be that place of temporal Punishment, which the holy Catholick Church commonly call's Purgatory; Which may be confirm'd by the 25 & 26. v. of the same Chap. where we read thus: *agree with your adversary quickly whiles you are in the way with him, lest the adversary would deliver thee to the judge & the judge deliver thee to the officer. &*

thou be cast in pr. son. verily I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast payed the uttermost farthing. Whereby the reader may see, that the word of God confirms the premisses, by bidding us to make penance in this world, lest we shu'd be sent to that prison, out of which we cannot go till we pay the last farthing: that is to say, untill our souls will be purifi'd from all manner of finnes, as the following Fathers do expressly declare. Tertullian in his book de Anima. c 17. S. Cyprian in his 4th. book Epist. 2. Origines hom. 35 in Lucam Eusebius Emisenus hom 3 de Epiphāia. St Ambrose expounding the 12. c of Luke & St. Hierome on thee afore

said

said text' where he sayes the  
 following words: *this is what St.  
 Matthew declares you shall not go out  
 of the prison, till also the small sins  
 be punish'd. Matt. c. 12 v. 32. and  
 whosoever speaketh a word against the  
 son of man it shall be forgiven him: but  
 whosoever speaketh against the holy  
 Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him nei-  
 ther in this world neither in the world  
 to come.* Which words S. Matthew  
 wou'd not have said, If he had not  
 suppos'd, that some sins will be  
 forgiven in the world to come.  
 We find also the following words  
 in St. Pauls first Epist. to the Co-  
 rinthians c. 3 v. 15. *ff any mans worke  
 shall be burnt, he shall suffer losse; but  
 himself shall be sav'd yes so, as by fire.*  
 By which words S. Paul clearly  
 affirms,

firms that some souls after leaving this world shall be purg'd, and purifi'd by a temporal fire; as the following Fathers do testifie: St. Ambrose in his commentary on this text, & in his 20. ser. on the 118. psal: S. Hierome on the 4. Chap. of Amos, St. Augustin on the 37. Plal. & S. Gregorie in his 4. book of Dialogues c. 39.

Now let us heare the holy Fathers very words. S. Denis (who has been St. Paul's Disciple, in his book de Eccles. Hier, c. 7.) sayes thus: *Then the Venerable Bishops do draw near, and perform the holy prayers over the dead, beseeching the divine clemency, to forgive the dead all the finnes, which he committed by his human weaknesse, and to place him in*  
light

light, and in the region of the living, Tertullian (who liv'd in the year 200. in his book de Monogamia) bids a certain woman, to pray and give offerings for the soul of her deceased husband. Origenes (who liv'd in the year 226. hom. 6 on Exod. speaking of the soul's progresse, when it comes to Purgatory) saves the following words: and when it is arrested there if one will bring many good works and a little iniquity, that little is purg'd and dissolv'd even as lead is by fire St. Athanasius (who liv'd in the 4 age, in his 34. Question to Antiochus, speaking of the Prayers and oblations offer'd for the dead) sayes thus: If they wou'd not receive some benefit by this, certainly there wou'd be no

commemoration made in grief, sorrow  
and unerals... we know the souls of  
sinners to receive some benefit by the  
bloody sacrifice & by the gratification  
offer'd for them, as our Lord who has  
the dominion of both the quick and  
the dead, order'd and commanded. St. I  
Cyrill of Ierusalem (who liv'd about  
the same age, Catech. Myst: sayes  
the following words: we  
pray for all those, who dy'd among  
us, believing the oblation of the holy  
terrible sacrifice to be a great help  
those souls, for whom it is offer'd St. I  
Ephrem (who liv'd the same time  
in his last will: earnestly beeches  
the people to be alwayes mindfull  
him self in their Prayers St. Basil  
(who also the liv'd) instituted  
Oration in his Liturgie, in order  
to

sorrow said for the dead; and on the 9.  
 of Isaiah, he sayes thus: there-  
 he if we will discover the sinne by  
 confession, we shall dry, even as the  
 which is eaten, and it is fit that  
 fire should make an end of  
 death, it dose not threaten perpetuall death,  
 exile, but it grants purging: accord-  
 to that of the Apostle, but him-  
 self shall be sav'd, yet so as by fire.  
 Gregorie Nazianzen (who liv'd  
 the year 370. in his Funeral Ora-  
 tion of Cælarus most humbly be-  
 seeches the Christians to pray for  
 the souls of the dead, and himself  
 prayes: for the soul of Cælarus,  
 in the same Oration. St. Epipha-  
 nius (who as been contemporary  
 to St. Gregorie, in the end of his  
 work against Heresis ( numbers  
 the

prayers for the dead amongst the doctrine of the holy Catholic Church; and Heretic 75. he calls Acrius an heretick, for denying it to be lawfull to pray for the dead. St. Ambrose (who also liv'd about the same time, in his 2<sup>d</sup> book Epist. 8. which is to Faustus concerning his sisters death) says thus: therefore I do judge that she is not as much to be moan'd, as she is to be oblig'd by prayers, neither is she to be griev'd by your tears; but rather her soul is to be recommended to God by oblations & in his Orations of Theodosius, Valentinianus & Saurinus death, he prays most fervently for their souls, & promises to offer sacrifices for them; And expounds the 3<sup>d</sup> Chap. of St. Paul's Epist. the C



# Jennings Challenge 211

Corinthians, he sayes the following words: but when Paul sayes, as by fire indeed he declares that he shall be sav'd, but he will suffer the punishment of fire, that he may be purg'd by fire and made sound, and must not be tormented perpetually by eternal fire, as the traitours are. he has such a nother passage in his 10th in psal 118. St. Gregorie Nyssa (who liv'd the year 380 in his Oration of the dead) sayes thus: wherefore, that both the dignity of human nature and free will might be left, and that the evil might cease, divine wisdom invented this means. . . . either in this present life one must be purg'd by prayers, and exercise of virtue, or after his death to be cleans'd in the furnace of purging fire . . . he cannot

cannot be capable to enjoye God, until  
 Purgatory fire will take away the spots  
 disse'd on the soul. St Hieron  
 (who liv'd in the year 390. in his  
 Epist. to Pammachus concerning  
 the death of Paulina) sayes that  
 other husbands do spread violets, roses,  
 lilies, and flowers upon the tombes  
 their wives; but our Pammachus  
 uses the baljom of alms: knowing  
 to be written, that as water quenches  
 fire, even so alms quenches the sinnes  
 and expounding the 4. chap. of  
 Amos, he also sayes thus: according  
 to that, which we read in St Pauls  
 shall be sav'd, yet so as by fire: therefore  
 he who is sav'd by fire, is hurry'd  
 away as if it were a fire-brand out of the  
 burning flame. St Chrysostome (who  
 liv'd in the year 398. hom 41. on St  
 Pauls

Pauls first Epist. to the Corinthi-  
 (speaking of the dead) sayes  
 following words: let us assist  
 them, not with tears, but with prayers  
 supplications, alms and oblations;  
 these things has not been rashly  
 omitted; neither is it in vain that we  
 remember those who dy'd, in the divi-  
 ne Mysteries, and that we pray for  
 them, beseeching the expos'd lambe,  
 that takes away the sinnes of the world  
 thence forth they might have some  
 consolation... therefore let us help  
 them and let us perform their com-  
 munion; for if Iobs sacrifice made sa-  
 tisfaction for his sons! what do you  
 doubt? if those who dy'd has some  
 consolation we offering sacrifice for  
 them. More of St. Chrysostom's Au-  
 thority may be seen, in my answer

to the first point: and in his  
 hom. in Ioann & 21 in acta Apost  
 St Augustin (who liv'd in the  
 year 426. in his 21. book of the  
 City of God c. 27) sayes, that there  
 are some Saints, who after their  
 death goe straight to heaven and  
 afterwards can help others: and  
 that there are others of such a  
 life, who after their death are not  
 sav'd, neither can they help others  
 and finally that there are others  
 who after their death cannot go  
 straight to heaven by the virtue  
 of their own proper merits; but  
 that they can be reliev'd, by the  
 merits and good works of their  
 friends; and in the 16th chap of  
 the same book, (speaking of the  
 infants, who immediatly dye after  
 their

is their Baptism), he sayes thus: It is  
 A point only that Eternal punishment is  
 to the prepar'd for them; but neither shall  
 of them suffer Purgatory torments; and  
 then the 24. Chap. he puts a question  
 at hequirig, why dole not the Chur-  
 men pray for thole who dye with-  
 out repentance; & answers sayig  
 thus: It's because they are computed  
 to be of the divels party . . . but the  
 Church & faithfull's prayers are heard  
 for the behalfe of others, who did not  
 give themselves so ill in this life;  
 neither did they deserve to go directly  
 to heaven; In his booke of Homilies  
 the 16. he sayes, that those who  
 die in sinnes deserving temporal  
 punishments, shall go thro' pur-  
 gatory fire according to that of  
 Isaiah he shall be sav'd, as by fire.  
 P And

And expounding the 37. psalm. he sayes thus: that fire is slighted because it's said he shall be sav'd. it's sure: but altho' he shall be sav'd by fire; yet that fire is more grievous than anything, that a man can suffer in this life. In his 2. book de Genesi c. 20 (speaking of him who makes not good use of his life) he sayes thus: after this life, he shall either suffer the purging fire, or eternal punishment; & in his book de Cura pro Mortuis c. 1. he sayes the following words: we read in the Machabees that sacrifice has been offered for the dead but altho' it would never be read in the old Testament, yet the Authority of the whole Church which is manifest in this custom, is not weak, where in the priests prayers  
which

# Jennings Challenge 217

which are offer'd to God at his Altar,  
 the commemoration for the dead be  
 all in one place, and in the 4. c. of  
 the same book he sayes thus: sup-  
 plications for the souls of the dead ought  
 not so be omitted, which are so be  
 made for all those who dy'd in the  
 Christian and Catholick society, tho:  
 their names be not specif'd, the  
 Church receives it under a General  
 commemoration, that it might be  
 offer'd by the holy publick mother for  
 them, even as for those who has not  
 parents or children, relation or friends  
 to remember them; and in the 18. c.  
 speaking of the sacrifices, pray-  
 ers, and alms which are offer'd  
 for the dead, he sayes the follo-  
 wing words, they do not avail to  
 those for whom they are offer'd, but  
 P. 8 only

only to those who deserv'd it when they liv'd, but because we cannot discern who are those, it must needs be offer'd for all Christians; in his 9th. book of Confession c. 13. he earnestly beseeches others to pray for the soul of his mother Monica; and in his book of heresie c. 53. he calls Acrius a heretick for not allowing sacrifice to be offer'd for the dead; more of his Authority may be seen in my answer to the first point.

Now let us heare the Councils decrees. It was enacted in the 29 Chap. of the 3. Council of Carthage the year 397. that the holy sacrament shu'd not be receiv'd by any, but by those who wou'd be fasting, and in case



that there wou'd be any office  
to be perform'd in the afternoon,  
for the dead, that it shu'd be  
only perform'd in prayers with-  
out offering the holy sacrifice.  
It was also decreed in the 47.  
chap. of the 4. Council of Car-  
thage celebrated the year 398 that  
in prayers and oblations there  
shu'd be a commemoration made  
of those who accidentally would  
dye in their Journey or by sea, If  
they executed attentively the  
law of penance. Likewise it was  
enacted in the 34. chap. of the  
first Council of Bracara (now  
call'd Braga, a City in Portugal  
the year 412.) not to pray for the  
souls of those who wou'd kill  
themselves; and in the 39 chap.  
of

P3

of the same Council the clergy were commanded to divide the ablations which wou'd be offer'd amongst themselves, that equally they might be oblig'd to pray for the dead. It was also decreed in the Council of Cavaillon (a town in France the year 470) that they shu'd pray in their solemn Masses for the souls of the dead c. 16. which may be seen de Consec Dist 1. Can. Visum est; and the same was practis'd before in France: as is evident by the 6. Canon of the Council of Vascos produc'd in my answer to the first point.

But that I may not be too tedious in proving the minor, I shall conclude with the following revelations

relations. St. Gregorie relates  
in his 4th. book of Dialogues  
(c. 40) that the soul of Paschasius  
appear'd to the holy Bishop St.  
Germanus, and told him that  
God was pleas'd to release him-  
self out of Purgatory by his pra-  
yers; he also relates (c. 55) that the  
soul of a certain monke appear'd  
to himself, and told him that it  
was releas'd by the vertue of  
thirty masses which he order'd to  
be said for him. St. Gregorie  
the bishop of Tours (in his book  
de Gloria Confessorum c. 5.) af-  
firms that the soul of Vitulina  
appear'd to St. Martin, and told  
him that it suffer'd the punish-  
ment of Purgatory by reason of  
a smal sinne, which she committed  
ted

ted in this life. Venerable Bede (in his 5. book of the Historie of Englād, c. 13) relates that terrible vision of Driethelme, who after his death reviv'd and told wonderfull things concerning hell, Purgatory, and Paradise. Petrus Damianus (in his Epist. to Desiderius) relates that the soul of Severinus the Bishop of Collein appear'd to a certain Priest and told that he suffer'd in purgatory, because when he was a live he did not use to say his canonical hours in distinct times, but said all in the morning, that he might spend the whole day attending temporal affairs & also St. Bernard (writing the life of St. Malachias) relates that his  
Sisters

Sisters soul appear'd to St. Malachias, and told him that it suffer'd the pains of Purgatory. and Gulielmus Abbas (writing the life of St. Bernard in his first book c. 10) sayes that one of St. Bernards monks (who dy'd) appear'd to St Bernard, and told him that he was releast out of purgatory by his prayers. It is also to be seen in the life of St Anselmus that he was for a whole twelve-moonth offering sacrifices for the releasment of a certain friends soul, who was punish'd in Purgatory, but was releast thro' the merits of God and by his continual prayers. several other revelations might be produced, which for brevity sake I omit.

mit to insert here: for I suppose what I have already produc'd to have evidently made out the verity, of my minor, and also to have fully satisfi'd the reader.

*Chap 11 Proving that all those of the Primitive Church had not the word of God in their Mother tongue, and that the reading thereof is not profitable (or generally allowed) to all people.*

There were severall nations in the first five centurys who did not generally understand either the Syriack, Hebrew, Greeck, or Latin Tongue: therefore there were severall nations in the first five centurys, who had not the word of God in their own tongue. the antecedent is evident

Acts Cap 2. as may be seen in my  
answer to the adversary's 3. point.  
And I prove the consequence  
thus: the word of God was nei-  
ther written, or translated into  
any other language in the first  
five Centuries, but only in the  
aforesaid: as all ancient writers  
do unanimously affirm: therefore  
there were several nations in the  
first five Centuries, who had not  
the word of God in their own  
tongue, who consequently cou'd  
not read the Scripture: nay those  
who cou'd understand some of  
these languages, had no General  
accesse to the reading thereof;  
for in those times there were but  
few examples of it, which were  
only in Manuscript (for the art  
of

of Printing was not then found out, nor in a long time after) & receiv'd by the Church: as St Denis the Arcopagite declares (in his book de Eccles. Hier.) saying, *that the sacred mysteries were kept secret from the commonality* whereby it appears that it was then needlesse to prohibit them to read the scripture; whereas they were otherwise hinder'd by the aforesaid impediments; It also appears that the reading thereof in the Mother tongue is not necessary for all nations; for if it were; certainly those of the Primitive Church wou'd translate it into several other languages and the Apostles, who had the gift of all tongues (Acts c. 2.)

wou'd



you'd not only write the new Testament in Greek, Hebrew, & Latin, (as they have done) but also in other languages in which they preach'd the gospel through out the universal world, according to that of St. Paul to the Romans 10 v. 18. neither wou'd S. Paul write in Greeck, but in Latin to the Romans, whose vulgar language was not the Greeck, but the Latin tongue; and St. Peter and St. James wou'd not write in Greeck their Epistles to the Jewes, but in the languages of those countreyes wherein they were dispers'd, which then have been the Jewes maternal languages, and not the Greeck: neither wou'd St. Iohn write his  
first

first Epist. in Greeck to the Parthians, whose maternal Language was not the Greeck but another distinct Language; whereby it plainly appears that neither the Apostles or the Primitive Church ever believ'd that it was necessary for all nations to have the word of God in their own tongue.

Now let us see, who are those that are oblig'd to, expound read, and interpret the word of God to the  $\psi$  which I will produce the following Authority es. St. Basil (in his 25 Question) sayes, that it is the superiors obligation (that is to say the pastors) to know and learn those things, which afterwards they ought to teach others, but of others not

now more then behoves them; and  
 S. Augustin (in his first book de  
 moribus Ecclesie c. 1.) puts the  
 Question inquiring, what man  
 of judgment doth not understand that  
 the exposition of the scripture is to be  
 ask'd of them who by their profession  
 are Doctors of the Church. which  
 may be further confirm'd by the  
 Eunuch's example (Acts c. 8. v.  
 31 & 35) for when Philip ask'd  
 him did he understand what he  
 was reading out of Itaiiah he' an-  
 swer'd saying, how can I understand  
 except some man should guide me  
 wherefore he desir'd Philip to  
 sit with him, in order to expound  
 to him, which Philip willingly  
 perform'd (knowing that it was  
 his obligation) whereby it ap-  
 pears

pears, that the Eunuch, tho' a man  
 of great Authority (with Queen  
 Candace) yet did not presume to  
 interpret the scripture himself,  
 but ask'd the meaning thereof  
 from one of those, who were ap-  
 pointed by God in order to in-  
 struct and teach others; accord-  
 ing to that of St. Paul to the E-  
 phesians c. 4. v. 11 12' & 14 saying  
 thus: *and he gave some Apostles and  
 some prophets, and some Evangelists &  
 some pastors, and teachers for the per-  
 fecting of the Saints, for the worke of  
 the ministry, for the edifying of the  
 body of Christ; that we hence forth may  
 be no more children toss'd to and fro,  
 and carri'd about with every wind of  
 Doctrine by the slight of men and  
 cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in*

*not to deceive.* to prevent which  
 danger St. Paul himselfe in his  
 Epist. to the Hebrewes. 13 v.  
 17) expressly commands us to  
 obey the pastors, and to submit  
 our selves to their judgments  
 whom God imploy'd to rule us,  
 and watch over our soules, for  
 which they must give an account  
 for the want of which submissi-  
 on, and due obedience to the  
 lawfull Pastors, and Doctors of  
 the true Church tis a most la-  
 mentable prospect to behold the  
 miserable condition, wherein  
 those of Ireland, England, Scot-  
 land, Holland &c are, ever since  
 they unfortunately (by the apos-  
 tacy of Luther, and Calvin in  
 the 16 age) have deserted their

Q

true

true and lawfull mother, the Church at Rome, which is (as St. Augustin<sup>us</sup> affirms in his first book of Symbol to the Cateched. c. 6) the holy Church, the only Church, the true Church, the Catholick Church, that fights against all hereiticks, yet cannot be convine'd, all heresies deserts her, even as useless twigs, that are cut from the vine, but she still remains in her root, in her vine and in her charity. which character the pretended reformers cannot give to any of their own new Conventicles; who are always in a continual confusion, never agreeing among themselves, for every different sect of them supports the tenets of it's own doctrine by some misinterpreted

the text of scripture (even as those  
hereticks of the Primitive Church)  
which is so inculcated in their  
brains, that each of them is ready  
to sacrifice his life for the defence  
of his own particular Doctrine:  
the Lutherans condemning the Calvinists,  
the modern Presbyterians condemning the reformed  
Church of England, the Anabaptists,  
and Quakers despising all others,  
in respect of their own purity;  
some of them admitting all the books  
of scripture to be canonical, others  
affirming part of it to be apocriphall;  
some adding to their Bibles, that which  
they suppose the Apostles either neglected,  
or forgot; others diminishing, and  
taking away what

in their opinion were first put-in over-plus, which now a dayes they find disagreeable to their own principles; by reason of which alteration, several of their Bibles do differ in many places; which is to be admir'd, for how durst they be so presumptuous? as to alter or corrupt it, being he is curs'd, who adds to, or diminisheth the word of God. Revelation, c. 22. v. 18. 19. for since we are all certain that the first Bible, which the holy Catholick Church receiv'd from the Apostles, (and us'd it for the space of 14. hundred and odd years, after Christs birth) was written by the inspiration of the holy Ghost: what kind of any tolerable pretence can they have

now



now after so many ages to alter  
and corrupt it, whereas very of-  
ten the altering of one letter chan-  
ges the sense of a whole sentence;  
much more w<sup>h</sup>ē they alter words,  
nay whole sentence! as if what  
God ordain'd in the beginig, had  
now need to be corrected by their  
wisdom; to such presumptuous  
people might be we apply'd the  
following words of Christ Matt.  
G. 7. v. 6. *give not that which is  
holy unto the dogs; neither cast ye your  
pearls before swine, lest they trample  
them under their feet, and turn again,  
and rent you.* So that it appears if  
those corrupters cou'd cloake by  
any pretention their ungodly de-  
sign, that they wou'd not leave  
one text in the whole scripture,

Q;

which

which they find disagreeable to their own principles, but what they would alter or corrupt; & if in case any zealous Christian shu'd offer to dissuade their followers from perusing it after that corruption, they would imprudently answer, (as they do now) that if they shud be hinder'd from reading the word of God in their own tongue; that they would be kept in ignorance and darkness, as the Papists are; so that as the serpent deceiv'd Eve perswading her to eat of the forbidden fruit, that she might come to the knowledge of good and evil (Gen. c. 3) even so the devil by his subtilty and ambusses deludes the poor ignorant people perswading them to read

read expound and interpret their corrupted Bibles, and not to be beholding to the Church or pastors, who might deceive them, in teaching that which wou'd be contrary to the word of God, to prevent which, now their very tinkers, cobblers, butchers, tailers, and all sort of curious, and ignorant mechanicks do take the liberty of interpreting and expounding the whole Bible to their own ruine and destruction, 2. Petri c. 3. v. 16. for how can such ignorant people understand, or expound either to themselves, or to others the prophesie of Ezekiel, of Daniel the Revelations of St. Iohn? where (as S. Hierome affirms, every sentence is a mystery

tery: which of them can expound the Canticles, or what Salomon meāt by those similitudes of Gods Church? or the following texts? *I am the Lord they God visiting the iniquity of the Fathers upon the children unto the 3. & 4. Generation* Exod. c. 20. v. 5. which seems to be contradicted by that of Ezekiel c. 18. v. 20 saying thus: *the soul that sinneth it shall die, the son shall not bear the iniquity of the Father.* we are expressly commanded by the 20. c. v. 12. of Exodus to *honour our Fathers, and mothers.* But it is said in the 14. Chap. of Luke v. 26 that *he, who hates not his Father and mother... cannot be the disciple of Christ.* Moreover Deuteronomie c. 6. v. 13. it is written, that  
then

thou shalt fear the Lord thy God & serve him, and swear by his Name. Which seems to be contradicted by that of St. Mat. 6. 5. v. 34. where we read thus. I say unto you swear not at all. these and several other texts (which might seem to the unlearned to contradict each others, and also the misteryes of the holy scripture) do exceed the poor ignorant people's understanding and weake capacity, nay the very Disciples of Christ, could not understand the propheties of the old Testament, untill their understanding were open'd, whereby they came to their true knowledge: as evidently appears Luke 6. 14. v. 17. and 45. where we read the following words. and  
beginning

*begining at Moses and all the prophets  
he expounded unto them that things  
concerning himself; then he opened  
their understanding, that they might  
understand the scriptures. For want  
of which understanding in the  
law of God, the pretended refor-  
mers, and also the ancient here-  
ticks of the Primitive Church,  
deserted their true Mother, the  
holy Catholick Church; by misin-  
terpreting the word of God; as for  
example: the Arians denying  
the 2. person of the Blessed Trini-  
ty to be God, and alleaging for  
their ground, that of St. John c.  
17. v. 11. saying thus: holy Father  
keep through thine own Name, those  
whom thou hast given me, that they  
may be one as we are. the Eunomians  
asserting*

asserting the holy Ghost not to be God, and producing for their Authority that of Christ Matt. c. ii. v. 27. where he sayes thus: *all things are deliver'd unto me by my Father, neither knoweth any man the Father, save the son' and he to whomsoever the son will reveal him.* the Eutychians affirming, the divine nature in Christ to have been converted into his human nature, and alleaging for their ground that of St. John c. i. v, 14. where we read the following words. *& the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.* The Berengarians, Wicklefians, Husites, Lutherans, and Calvinists err'd so grossly & in so many texts of scripture, by reason of the great liberty they tooke

tooke in interpreting, and expounding it to the advantage of their own design that their errors (if they were all related) would require a whole book to themselves; so that it plainly appears, that the reading, and interpreting of the scripture is not profitable to all people, & specially to those, who do not recur for the interpretation thereof to the holy Catholick Church, which has a promise of the infallible assistance of the holy Ghost to the consumation of the world Matt. c. x. v. 20. so that the Church of Rome had great reason to hinder the ignorant sort of people, (who might easily be deceiv'd) from perusing it, without having license from



d ex from their respective Bishops, &  
ge of especially in those countreyes  
error where heresie abounds and where  
woud Bibles are corrupted; fearing lest  
hem that instead of acquiring more  
ears, knowledge thereby, they might  
rpre- peradventure fall into greater  
pro- ignorance, or some heresie as the  
ly to asor said sectaries have done; &  
the in so prohibiting she imitates  
holy the example of fond parents, who  
as a keeps all sort dangerous weapons  
tan- from the hands of their children  
con- & forbids them all kind of diet,  
at which might occasion, or create  
ome any ill distemper.

*Chap. 12. Proving that the pretended reformers Doctrines are but a heap of several old heresies lawfully condemn'd by the Primitive Church.*

having

Having sufficiently made-out by the same Authorities (which my adversary in his Challenge defies to be produc'd) that the old and present Church of Rome is still the same in principles; 'tis now fit that I shu'd let my adversary know what principles himself, & the rest of the new reformers do embrace; I will only produce the following point.

1 The Arians demolish'd, and threw down the Altars where upon the holy sacrifice were wont to be offer'd; as the following Fathers do relate: St. Athanasius in his Epist. de fuga sua, Theodoretus in his 4th. book of History c. 19. & 20. and Ruffinus in his 11. book c. 2,

Martin

Martin Luther, who apostated from the Church of Rome the year 1517. and John Calvin who did the same the year 1538. caus'd also the Altars of those Churches, which were under their jurisdictions, to be throw down & demolish'd: as may be seen in Luther's book de Formula Missæ pro Ecclesia Wittenbergenfi. & in Calvin's 4th. book of Institutions c. 18.

2 The Arians rejected all traditions, which were not written in the word of God: as St. Augustin in his first book against Maximinus c. 2. & last, testifies; which heresie the Nestorians, & Eutychians held after-wards: as appears by the first Action of the

246 *An Answer to mr.*

2. General Council of Nice; the Nestorians errors were condemn'd by the General Council of Ephese the year 431. as may be seen Tomo 3 Conciliorum.

Luther in his commentary on St Pauls Epist. to the Galatians c. 2. and Calvin in his 4. book of Institutions c. 8. held also the same heresie.

3. The Arians and Eunomians deny'd that Images ought to be venerated: as the Fathers of the 2. Council of Nice, do relate in the 6. Action.

John Calvin in his first book Chap. 11. and in his 4. book c. 9. and now all the reformers do teach the same

4. The Arians held that there

is no difference between Bishops and Priests, but that they are of equal dignity and jurisdiction: As St. Epiphanius heretic 75. & St. Augustin heretic 33. do write.

Luther in his book of the Captivity of Babylon cap. de Ordinis Sacramento, and adversus falso nominatum ordinem Episcoporum and Calvin in his 4. book of Institutions c. 3. held likewise the same heretic, which now the presbyterians, and several others doe embrace

The Arians did not judge it lawfull to pray for the dead, or to offer any sacrifice or alms for their releasment, and did not believe that there was any place of temporal punishments after this  
R life

life; as St. Augustin heresie 33  
and St. Epiphanius heresie 75 do  
relate; the Cerinthians held the  
same as, St. Epiphanius writes  
heresie 28. the Cerinthians er-  
rors were condemn'd by the Ge-  
neral Council of Ephese the  
year 431. as may be seen tomo 3.  
Conciliorum; as for the Arians  
errors they have been condemn'd  
by all the following Councils  
(viz) by the Council of Alexan-  
dria the year 355. tomo 1. Concilio-  
rum, by the Councils of Rome  
which sate the year 337. and the  
year 369. by the first General  
Council of Nice the year 325.  
the first General Council of Con-  
stantinople the year 381. and by  
the Council of Ariminum which  
sate the year 359. all which Coun-  
cils

*Jennings Challenge* 249

cils are to be seen tomo 2. Con-  
ciliorum, their errors were also  
condemn'd by the General  
Council of Ephese the year 431  
tom. 3. Conciliorum; by the Coun-  
cil of Calcedon, that sat the year  
451 tom. 4. Conciliorum, and by  
the Fathers of the 2. Council of  
Constantinople the year 536.  
which may be seen tomo 5. Con-  
ciliorum.

Luther in his Epist. to the Val-  
dinians & Calvin in his 3 book of  
Institutions c. 5. taught also  
this last point of the Arian  
heresie about Purgatory, which  
now all their followers do firmly  
believe;

6 The Novatians believ'd that  
confirmation was no sacrament

as

as Theodoretus in his 3 book de Hære. Fab. writes; & the Donatists believ'd the same: as Optatus, in his 2 book against Perminian relates:

Luther in his book of the Captivity of Babylon cap. de Confirmatione, and Calvin in his 4th, book of Institutions c. 19 did embrace, & teach the same heresie

7 The Novatians held that the Church had no power to forgive sins committed after Baptism, & consequently they did not allow auricular confession, or that the Church cu'd grant Indulgence as all the following Fathers do write St. Cyprian in his 57. Epist. to Pope Cornelius St. Epiphanius heresie 59 St Augustin



in heresie 38 and Theodorētus in his 3. book de hæreticis fabulis; the Novations errors have been condemn'd by the Council of Carthage the year 252. by the Council of Rome the year 253. by the Council of Italy the same year & by the Council of Arles the year 452. as may be seen tomo 1. and 4. Conciliorum.

Luther in his book of the Captivity of Babylon Cap. de extrema unctione, & Calvin in his 4. book of Institutions c. 19 held also this point of the Novatian heresie.

8 The Donatists gave out that the Catholick Church fell from the true faith of Jesus Christ, and

and that themselves were renewing it again in Africk: as Optatus in his 1. 2. & 6. book against the Donatists, and St. Augustin heresie 69. and in his book de veritate Ecclesie c. 12. do relate.

Luther in his discourse tomo 2. cap. de partibus and Calvin in his 4th. book c. 2. likewise gave out that the holy Catholick Church fell visibly from the true faith, and that themselves were reviving it again: it's therefore they & their followers are call'd reformers.

9 The Donatists held that the holy Eucharist ought not to be ador'd, they brake-down the Altars, and gave the blessed sacrament to their dogs: as Optatus  
in

*Jennings Challenge* 253

in his 2. & 6. book against Per-  
minian, and St. Augustin in his  
2. book against Petilian c. 51. 60.  
in his 3<sup>rd</sup>. book c. 40. and also  
in his 163 Epist. do relate.

Luther in his book de Eucharis-  
tia ad Waldenses, and Calvin  
de vitandis superstitionibus, held  
likewise that the holy Eucharist  
ought not to be ador'd:

10 The Donatists deny'd the  
Pope of Romes supremacy: as O-  
patius and St. Augustin do declare  
in the afor said books,

Luther in his book de potestate  
Papæ and assertione articuli 25:  
and Calvin in his 4<sup>th</sup>. book of  
Institutions c. 6. deny'd the  
same.

11 The Donatists reprov'd the  
life

life and vows of monks and religious people: as also Optatus & St. Augustin write in the aforesaid books; Vigilantius and Petilianus reprov'd the same; as St. Hierome in his book against Vigilantius, and St. Augustin in his 3. book c: 40 against Petilianus do affirm; but the Donatists errors were declar'd to be false & erroneous Doctrines by the Council of Rome the year 413. by the Councils which sate in Africk in the time of Innocentius the first being the begining of the 5. Century and by several other Councils

Martin Luther writing of the monastical vows held also this last point of the Donatists heresie,

so that he might have some  
kind of pretence to dispence with  
himself in his three religious  
vows & merrie Cathrine the Nun,  
whom he deluded out of her  
monastery; our Saviour Iesus  
Christ most strictly commands us  
to beware of the doctrine of such  
false Prophets, and he tells us,  
that we shall know them by their  
fruits; here are his very words. Be-  
ware of false prophets, which come to  
you in sheeps clothing, but in-wardly  
they are ravening wolves. ye shall  
know them, by their fruits: do men ga-  
ther grapes of thorns, or figs of this-  
tles? even so every good tree bringeth  
forth good fruit, but a bad tree bringeth  
forth evil fruit. Matt c. 7. v. 15. 16.  
& 17.

12 The Eustachians endeavor'd to demolish and extirpate the Ecclesiastical convents; as Iocartes in his 2 book c. 33 and Sozomenus in his 3. book c. 13, do relate; the Eustachians errors have been condemn'd by the Fathers of the Councill of Gangris, which was the year 324.

Luther and Calvins Disciples did embrace this Eustachian error, for they threw-down all the convents and monasteries of those Countreyes and Provinces, wherein they made any conquest.

13 All the following hereticks rejected matrimony & deny'd it to be a Sacrament, as these Fathers do write of their heresie; Simon Magus: as St Augustin in his book

*Jennings Challenge.* 157

heresibus c. 1. Nicolaites as  
Epiphanius heresie 15 Titia-  
as St. Irenæus in his first book  
31 Adamiani, as St. Augustin  
heresie 31 the Manicheans as St.  
Augustin heresie 46 the Eusta-  
sians as Iocates in his 2. book  
33. Marcian as St Hierome in  
his first book against Jovinianus,  
and the Priscillanists: as St. Leos  
Epist declares; the Priscillanists  
errors were condemn'd by all the  
following Councils (viz) by the  
Council of Cæsaragust the year  
381. by the Council of Toledo  
the year 400. the Council of Bur-  
deaux the year 385. and by the  
Council of Spaine in the year  
447 which Councils are to be seen  
in *omo 2 & 1 Conciliorum*  
luther

Luther in his book de captivitate  
cap de matrimonio & Calvin in  
his 4 book of Institutions c. 19.  
held also that matrimony is no  
sacrament

14 Jovinianus held that there are  
no venial sins, but that all sins are  
mortal, as St. Hierome relates in  
his 2 book c. 15 & 16. against Jovi-  
nianus, and also St. Augustin he-  
refie 18; the Pelagians were of the  
same opinion as St. Hierome writes  
in his 2 book against them  
Jovinianus's errors were condem-  
n'd by the Fathers of the Coun-  
cil of Milan, which sate the  
year 390 tomo secundo Con-  
ciliorum; and so were the Pela-  
gians errors by the following  
Councils (viz) by the Mheviat  
council



*Jennings Challenge* 359

Concil the year 416 by the A.  
Council the year 418, as  
may be seen tomo secundo  
Conciliorum; and also by the Ge-  
ral Council of Ephese, which  
the year 431 tomo 3 Conci-  
lium. Luther assertione articuli 31 &  
Calvin in his 2 book of Institi-  
ons c. 18 and in his 3 book c. 4  
add likewise that all sins are mor-  
tall. Simon Magus and Menander  
held that Christs true flesh is not  
really present in the holy Eu-  
charist: as St. Ignatius declares  
in his Epist. to those of Smyrna,  
which Theodoretus makes  
mention in his 3. dialogue, other  
hereticks of the Primitive  
Church

Church held the same, as St. Cyrill writes in his Epist. to Calosirius,

Tho' Luther never expressly affirm'd this point of the old heresie; yet all his Disciples do endeavour to defend it; and so do Calvin in his book de Cæna Domini, (where he reprehends Luther for not holding it,) and also in his 4 book c. 17.

16 Simon Magus held that faith alone is sufficient for salvation and consequently that good works are needless in order to salvation: as St. Irenæus in his first book c. 30. and Theodoretus de hereticis fabulis, do write. Eunomius held the same error as St. Augustin in his book de heresibus

resibus declares, c. 54

Calvin in his book de libertate christiana, and Calvin in his 3. book of Institutions c. 19. held to the same error, that thereby they might provoke others to be given to all kind of vices as themselves were.

7. The Eunomians held that the reliques of Saints ought not to be venerated, as Magnes in his 4 book against Theostines affirms, and Vigilantius held the same error: as St. Hierome writes in his book against Vigilantius that the Eunomians errors have been condemn'd by the 3. Council of Rome the year 369. by the general Council of Constantino-ple the year 381 tomo secundo Conciliorum

rum, by the Council of Calcedon  
which sate the year 451 tomo 4.  
Conciliorum & also by the Coun-  
cil of Constantinople the year 553.  
tomo 5 Conciliorum

Luther in his ser de cruce and  
in his book de missa abroganda,  
held the same and so did Calvin  
admonitione de reliquiis

18 Vigilantius affirm'd that it is  
unlawfull to invoke Saints, as  
St. Hierome writes in his book  
against Vigilantius's errors.

Luther in his book de Eucharis-  
tia ad Waldenses, and Calvin in  
his 3. book of Institutions c. 10.  
believ'd and held the same error.

19 The Massalians rejected the  
fast commanded by the Church  
as St. Epiphanius heresie 8. and  
Theodoreus

Theodoretus in his 4. book c. 11. do relate; the Arians did the same: as St. Augustin declares in his book of heresie c. 33. and so did the Eustachians as St. Epiphanius heresie 75. and Socrates in his 2. book c. 33. do write.

Calvin in his 4th. book of Institutions c. 12 rejected the same: which error both his and Luthers Disciples do willingly embrace, that they might indulge their own bodies, whilst they are in this world.

20 The Massalians held that holy order is no sacrament: as St. Damascenus relates in his first book of heresie. the Massalians errors were condemn'd by the Fathers of the Council of

264      *An Answer to mr.*

Syda, who late the year 383. as  
may be seen Tomo<sup>o</sup> 2. Conci-  
liorum, and by a nother Council  
in the Orient the year 417 Tomo  
3. Conciliorum

Luther in his book of the Cap-  
tivity of Babylon cap. de ordine,  
held also that holy order is no  
Sacrament, which error his Disci-  
ples do now firmly believe.

21 Helvidius raught that the  
Blessed Virgin Mary bore child-  
ren to Joseph, who were brothers  
to Iesus Christ; as St. Hierome  
relates in his book against Hel-  
vidius's errors, which were con-  
demn'd in the Council of Milan  
the year 390. as may be seen Tomo  
3. Conciliorum.

Calvin ad Caput 1. Lucæ af-  
firm'd

firm'd the same error, which several of his followers do now certainly believe.

22 Eusebius in his 3. book of history c. 25. and St. Hierome in his book de viris illustribus, do make mention of certain hereticks, who deny'd the Epist. of St. James, of Juda, the 2. Epist. of St. Peter, & also the 2. & 3. of St. John to be canonical

Luther in his prologue on these Epist. rejects St James. and Juda's Epistles; and he doubts of the rest to be canonical.

23 The Marcionites deny'd the revelations of St. John to be canonical, as Tertullian relates in his 3. & 4. book against Marcion the Theodosians deny'd the same

as St. Epiphanius writes hereſie  
51. & 54. the aforeſaid Martionites  
did alſo deny St. Pauls Epiſt. to  
the Hebrews to be canonical, as  
St. Hierome declares in his pre-  
face on St. Pauls Epiſt. to Titus,  
and ſo did Arius, as Theodoretus  
relates in his preface on St. Pauls  
Epiſt. to the Hebrews.

Luther in his preface on the old  
Teſtament affirms the revelation  
not to be canonical, and in his  
prologue on that to the Hebrews  
he ſayes likewise that it is not  
canonical

24 The Marcionites, & Baſilidi-  
ans held that all the old Teſtament  
was apocryphal; as St. Irenæus  
relates in his book c. 20. 22. &  
29. the Manicheans held the ſame



as St. Epiphanius affirms heresie  
66. but the Manicheans errors  
were condemn'd by the General  
Ephesian Council, the year 431.  
Tomo 3. Conciliorum, and also  
by the Council of Rome the year  
444. which is to be seen in the  
same Tome, as for the Marcioni-  
tes errors, they have been cōdem-  
n'd by the General Council of  
Calcedon the year 451. Tomo 4.  
Conciliorum, and by the 2. Coun-  
cil of Constantinople the year  
553. where also the Basilidians er-  
rors were condemn'd, as may be  
seen Tomo 5. Conciliorum.

Luther and Calvins Disciples  
are something milder than the  
aforesaid hereticks, for they do  
not affirm that all the old Testa-  
ment

ment is apocriphal; yet they deny several books of it, to be canonical, and chiefly those books, which evidently do falsifie their own principles.

If I had not suppos'd that the premisses might sufficiently demonstrate, what Doctrines my adversary and the reformers do maintain; I wou'd produce several other points of old heresies, which also they maintain, but lest I shu'd be too troublesome to the reader, I will only conclude with the following passage.

Whosoever maintains or hath for his principles the aforesaid points, is lawfully accus'd, for maintaining old heresies, false and erronious Doctrines confu-  
red

ted by the holy Fathers, and lawfully condemn'd by several Councils of the Primitive Church: but the pretended reformers do maintain and have for their principles the aforesaid points: therefore the pretended reformers are lawfully accus'd for maintaining old heresies false and erroneous Doctrines confuted by the holy Fathers, and lawfully condemn'd by several Councils of the primitive Church. the minor is manifest, as for the major it's prov'd, by what I have already produc'd: for certainly all those holy Fathers and Doctors, wou'd not make it their business to reprehend, and confute the chief promoters of the said points, if they had not understood.

understood, and firmly believ'd, that they taught false, and erroneous Doctrines: neither wou'd all the aforesaid Councils of the Primitive Church, (which my adversary in his challenge acknowledges to have then retain'd the true faith of Jesus Christ) condemn their Doctrines if they were not also Hethodox, & contrary to the true faith, which they and their forefathers receiv'd from Jesus Christ & his Disciples: therefore whosoever desires to find & embrace a Church, wherein the old incorrupted principles of Christianity are taught, and such Doctrines only as were maintain'd by the ancient & pure Church even of Rome for up-wards of 500 years

years after Christ, let him embrace the present Church of Rome, wherein the said principles are duly profess'd, the old, and the present Church of Rome being still the same in principles, whereas the Doctrines of those who now call themselves reformers, the Church of Englād, Presbyteriāns, Quakers &c. & wherein the said convincticles do now differ from the present Church of Rome, were never maintain'd by the ancient Church of Rome; but rather impiously brought in by a series of Hereticks, who for these very Doctrines, were from time to time condemn'd by many General, national, & Provincial Councils; & also by the most eminent Fathers  
and

and Doctors of the primitive Church; as the premisses do evidently make-out, so that the reader may take notice of my adversarys ignorance and presumption for censuring, & contradicting a religion so anciēt, which lawfull mission, acknowledgment of antiquity, holy Fathers, several Councils, divine miracles, & the word of God, do plainly demonstrate to be the only true and Apostolical line, which leads Souls to the true way of everlasting glory & happiness: therefore reader if you have been here tofore of my adversarys opinion, I beseech you for the love of Jesus Christ, to compare seriously his principles, and those of the Church of Rome together:

together, and then to consider  
 attentively the state and circum-  
 stances, wherein you are out of  
 the holy Catholick Church; out  
 of which there is no salvation to  
 be expected, as the following holy  
 fathers do openly declare. St. Cy-  
 rilian in his book de unitate Ec-  
 clesiae (speaking of those who are  
 out of the Church) sayes thus: *do*  
*they thinke Christ is amongst them?*  
*tho' they were drawn to torments, &*  
*execution for the confession of the name*  
*of Christ, yet this pollutio is not wash'd*  
*away, no! not with blood this inexpia-*  
*ble, and inexcusable crime, of schism*  
*is not purg'd away, even by death is-*  
*it.* St. Chrysostome (in his 11. hom.  
 on St. Pauls Epist. to the Ephesiāns)  
 sayes also thus: *there is nothing so*  
*pro*

provokes the wrath of God, as the division of the Church, in so much that tho' we shu'd have perform'd all other sort of good things, yet we shall incur a punishment no less cruel, for dividing the unity of the Church. than those who have done, who pierc'd and divided Christs body. St. Augustin in his 4. book of Symbole Cap: 10. sayes the following words. If any man be found separated from her, he shall be excluded from the number of the children, neither shall he have God for his Father, that wou'd not have the Church for his mother, and it will nothing avail him to have rightly believ'd, or to have done never so many good worces, without the conclusion of the sovereign good, and super gelta Emar. he sayes also the following words:



Jennings Challenge. 175

words: out of the Church an heretick  
 may have all things, but salvation,  
 he may have the sacraments, he may  
 have faith, and preach it ... only salva-  
 tion he cannot have; which may be  
 further confirm'd by the words of  
 St. James c. 2. v. 10. say'g thus: who-  
 ever shall keep the whole law and  
 yet offends in one point, he is guilty of  
 all. therefore being the salvation  
 of your soul doth wholly depend  
 on the true belief, and intire ob-  
 servation of all those points of  
 faith, which the holy Catholick  
 Church sufficiently proposes, &  
 universally teaches: I do earnestly  
 beseech you, to open the eyes of  
 your understanding (for I know  
 that you have no invincible ig-  
 norance

norance whereby you might be excus'd) to embrace the principles and Doctrines of that pure & ancient Church *against which the gates of hell cannot prevail* Matt. c. 16. v. 18. assure your self that I do not invite you to any old heresie (as my adversary does) nor (the Lord forbid) but to the religion preach'd and taught by Jesus Christ and his Disciples; to that I say where with your forefathers, and antecessors have been still contented, since ever they left Paganism, untill in the 16. age they were deceiv'd by the erroneous Doctrines of those false prophets; Luther, and Calvin, *hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard from me in faith and love*

# Zennings Challenge 277

which is in Christ Jesus 2. Timo-  
 thy c. 1 v. 13, neither give heed to  
 fables, and endless genealogies, which  
 minister questions, rather than Godly  
 edifying in the faith: from which some  
 having swerved have turn'd aside unto  
 vain jangling, desiring to be teachers  
 of the law, understanding neither what  
 they say, nor whereof they affirm. 1.  
 Timothy c. 1. v. 4. 6. 7. let not  
 willfull or gross ignorance, the  
 temporal riches and vanity of  
 this transitory world, or comply-  
 ance to the request of your friends  
 deceive & mislead you, but con-  
 sider seriously the very words of  
 your Saviour and redeemer Jesus  
 Christ Matt: c. 16. v. 26. saying  
 thus: for what is a man profited, if he  
 shall gain the whole world & loose his

*An Answer to my  
own soul? or what shall a man give in  
exchange for his own soul? what will  
it then avail you (after this life)  
to be now for few years, or day-  
es in great honour, favour & re-  
quest in this deceitfull world? &  
afterward to be perpetually tor-  
mented in pain, grief, & miseryes,  
with-out any hopes of mercy, or  
redemption, where neither friends  
pompe, nor riches can prevail in  
order to give you the least dram  
of consolation: from which pu-  
nishment the Lord Jesus Christ of  
his infinite mercy defend both  
you & me & all Christians, Amen.*

**FINIS.**

(1)

*An Answer to what one Whealy  
alleges (in his Almanack) against St.  
Peters Supremacy.*

---

**A**fter having compos'd this  
little work Whealy's Alma-  
nack (for the year 1699) came  
accidentally into my hands, where-  
in he (or some other malicious  
person in his name) labours to in-  
fect the whole Kingdom, with  
false & pernicious Doctrine, whi-  
ch he pretends to ground on  
some nonsensical arguments, that  
he forms against St. Peter & the  
Pope of Rome's Supremacy; and  
tho' 'tis hardly worth any mans

T

while

while to confute them; yet because it concerns what I have said in my Answer to mr lennings fourth point; I thinke it fit to let him know his own ignorance and the errors of his pretended Doctrine.

First he offers to inter (by a new invented consequence of his own) that Peter was neither Bishop of Antioch, or Rome, because (as he falsely alleages) the Papists have not as yet agreed among themselves about the time he first remov'd from Antioch to Rome.

But in case this had been true which I will shew hereafter to be false his illegal consequence does not follow: for tho' the Authors do not agree about the beginning of the weecks of Daniel (c. 9. v. 24.) pro;

to Whealy

3

propheſy'g the comm'g of Chriſt  
or how many years Saul did reign  
in Iſrael, or how many years  
there are ſince the creation of the  
world, ſhall we infer that Daniels  
propheſie never began, that Saul  
never reign'd in Iſrael, and that  
the world was never created? no,  
we leave ſuch illegitimate conſe-  
quences to Whealy, who as it ſeems  
cannot infer better.

His ſecōd argument is. *he that ſuf-  
fers rebuke is not ſuperior to him that gi-  
ves it: but Peter ſuffer'd rebuke from his  
fellow Apoſtle Paul (Gal. 2. v. 11. 12.)  
therefore Peter was not ſuperior to Paul.*  
This major is evidently falſe: as ap-  
pears in the firſt book of Kings, c. 13  
where we read that Saul tho King  
of Iſrael, ſuffer'd to be rebuk'd by  
Samuel; and in the ſecond book of

Kings c. 12. that David suffer'd to be rebuk'd by Nathan; & finally we read in the 6th. Chap. of St. John that our Saviour suffer'd not only the Jewes, but also the very Disciples to reprehend his words, when he told them that he wou'd give them his flesh to eat and his blood to drinke; we see also by daily experience, that Kings Magistrates, and superiours are reprehended by their inferiours, not only privatly, but in publick Sermons, when they preach against the vices of the said superiours: & indeed we see that the Prince of Orange has been often rebuk'd these six or seaven years past by Whealy in his yearly Almanacks, wherein he reflects with the vilest  
ex pre



to *Wheally*

expressions imaginable on their  
sacred Majesties, King James, his  
Queen, & the Prince of Wales;  
whereby the Prince of Orange,  
himself is consequently rebuk'd,  
yet never order'd the Author to  
be punish'd.

As for that action of Peter ~~not~~  
eating meat with the Gentiles,  
for which he was rebuk'd by  
Paul; let the adversary know that  
if Peter had ~~not~~ then eaten with  
the Gentiles, he would be sharply  
reprehended by ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~  
~~the~~ the Jewes & Pharesies, who  
thought it to be unlawfull by any  
means to keep company, eat, or  
drink with the Gentiles; and so  
Peter being between these two ex-  
treams, he thought it best <sup>not</sup> to eat

T3

with

with the Gentiles, and in so doing, he is not only excus'd, but highly commended by all the Eastern, and Grecian Fathers in their commentary on the aforesaid text; and St. Chrysostome in his commentary on the 10. Chap. of the Acts affirms that it was done by divine dispensation, which evidently appears Acts c. 11 v. 7. 8. & 9. where we read that Peter was ~~then~~ commended to eat with the Gentiles. And the motive that mov'd St. Paul to reprehend him, was fearing lest that others, who would not be in the same circumstances wherein Peter then has been or dispens'd with, as he was should be led by his example; for inferiours are commonly led by the examples

examples of their superiours, which to prevent in that point St. Paul thought it convenient to reprehend him whose humility, for not contradicting Paul (his inferior) is most highly pray'd by the following Fathers (viz) St. Cyprian in his Epist. to Quintus St. Augustin in his 19. Epist. St. Gregorie hom. 18: on Ezekiel, saying thus: behold St. Peter reprehended by his owne inferior, and does not receive reprehension.

As for these texts which the adversary brings out of St. Pauls second Epist. to the Cor. (c. 11. 5. and c. 12. v. 11.) they prove nothing against Peter's supremacy, for Pauls intercession was to stop the mouths of some adversaries he

he had among the Corinthians, that oppos'd his Doctrine, allea-  
ging it to be grounded on some  
subtile and sophistical arguments  
and not thought by Christ: as that  
of Peter, John, & James was &  
consequently ought not to be of  
any great Authority; which sus-  
picion occasion'd him to declare  
(in the aforesaid text) *that he was  
not inferior to any of the Apostles*; that  
is to say, that his Doctrine was  
as true, & of as much Authority  
(being written by the inspiration  
of the holy Ghost) as any of the  
Apostles Doctrine, which is true  
but nothing to the present purpose.

Whealy's third argument, *he  
that is accus'd by others and pleads  
his cause before them, is not superior*

*those*

those that accuses him, or before whom  
 he pleads, but St. Peter was accus'd  
 before the rest of the Apostles, & plea-  
 ded his cause before them at Hierusalem  
 (Acts. c. ii. v. 1 &c.) therefore Pe-  
 ter was not superior to the rest of the  
 Apostles. The major is false for  
 tho' a King is accus'd by some of  
 his own subjects, and pleads his  
 cause before the Parlemt, or a  
 Prince before a Council, a supe-  
 rior before his community; It  
 does not argue that the King has  
 no supereminency over the Parle-  
 mt; the Prince over his Coun-  
 cil, the superior over his commu-  
 nity; otherwise it might be law-  
 fully inter'd, that our Saviour  
 had no supereminency over his  
 own Disciples, before whom he  
 was

was often accus'd by the Jewes: as appears Matt. c. 21 Marke c. 15. Luke c. 23. John c. 5. 7 & 8.

As for that which Whealy brings out of Peter's second Epist c. 3. v. 2. it's not to his purpose, tho' he deceitfully wrests it in order to infer an unnatural consequence; for it was Peters intent in that Chap. to assure certain people of Christs coming to judgment &c. and to thinke the patience of God to conduce to their salvatiō, as Paul write to them in his Epistles; so that it was necessary for Peter to speake in the plural number: but perhaps Whealy by some new found Arithmetick, may make two into one: If so, I acknowledge that Peter ought to speake in the  
lin.

singular number: but it is too late  
for Whealy, after so many ages,  
to pretend to teach him how he  
ought to expresse himself in mat-  
ters of such great consequences.  
Whealy's fourth argument *herthat*  
*is sent is not superior to him that sends*  
*him, but when the Apostles at Hierusa-*  
*lem heard that Samaria receiv'd the*  
*word of God they sent to them Peter &*  
*John Acts. c. 8. v. 14. therefore Pe-*  
*ter was not superior to the rest of the*  
*Apostles.* this major is false, for one  
may undergo such a mission by his  
inferiors advise of his own accord,  
with-out any subjection to those  
that sends him; as is evident in the  
second book of Kings c 15 where  
we read that Samuel sent Saul  
(tho' King) to destroy Amaleck, &  
the

the children of Israel sent Phinehas their high Priest, and superior to the children of Ruben & Gad (then in the land Gilead) as may be seen in the 22, Chap. of Joshua v. 13 and finally Herod sent the wisemen over whom he had noe power to Bethelam to searge diligently for the child Matt: c 2. v. 8. so that Whealy can make no advantage of Peters missiō to Samaria, which favours not his design in the last; but rather confirms the cōtrary: whereas he denys Peter to have been bishop, for it was resolv'd by those that were in that assembly that it wou'd be expedient to send Bishop to the Samaritans who then receiv'd the faith in order to confirm



firm them in the same; so that it was agreed that John and the chiefest Bishop (viz,) Peter should go thither to perform the same, which they did to the Samaritans great satisfaction.

After this Whealy produces an argument which he found in a manual of controverſie (printed at Doway the year 1654) proving that to be the only Church of God, which hath had a continued ſucceſſion of Bishops & pastors from the time of Chriſt and the Apoſtles to this preſent day; which he denys with-out giving any Authority, or reaſon; but promiſes in the following page to confute it; I will be ſilent in the matter untill I ſee what he can alleadge againſt it. he

He afterwards cites out of the same manuel the following texts  
Ila. c. 59. v. 1. c. 60. v. 1. 3. 11. c. 62  
v. 6. Ezechiel c. 37 v. 26 & Da-  
niel c. 7 v. 13. 14 proving the in-  
fallibility of the Church which  
in Whealy's opinion can have  
no relation to it, they being write  
long before the Apostles dayes;  
but if this shu'd take place, it  
would as well prove that all the  
prophecies of the old Testament  
concerning Christs passion, resu-  
rection, and assention could have  
no relation to the said Mysteries  
they being prophesy'd long before  
any of them came to pass, all  
Whealy's witt can shew no tole-  
rable reason for denying the one  
and admitting the other; as for  
the

the texts which he brings out of  
Matt c. 28 v. 20 John c 14 v. 16.  
Ephe c. 4 v. 11. & 12 it is but some  
of Whealy's calumnyes to alleage  
that the Author of the said Ma-  
nuel ever Produc,d them in or-  
der to prove St Peter supremacy;  
whereas he only makes use of  
them to prove the visibility and  
infallibility of the true Church,  
and its continued succession of  
Bishops & Pastors from the time  
of the Apostles till now as appears  
in the 2. 37 & 45 page of the same  
Manuel

After this Whealy denyes Peter  
to have been Bishop of Antioch  
or Rome for six feveral reasons,  
and sayes in the first *that he can-*  
*not grant it because the scriptures are*  
*wholly*

wholly silent in the matter But if he can grant nothing wherein the scriptures are silent he is no true Christian for he does not believe or grant the Apostles creed or that at the present Bible of which he makes use himself to be the ſcattered word of God, or the baptism of children before they come to the years of discretion to be lawfull and sufficient for ſalvation ſeeing the scriptures are wholly ſilent in theſe matters beſides he poſſitively ſwears to ſeveral points that are not mention'd therein, and conſequently contradicts his owne aſſertion, this is too evident to require a proof for he wickedly ſwears & believes that the true fleſh & blood of Chriſt are not really preſent

present in the blessed Sacrament, that the Virgin Mary Mother of God hath no more power than a nother Woman, that the Bishop of Rome hath no spiritual or temporal jurisdiction over England, Ireland, or Scotland; and several other points propos'd by the present government: therefore he believes and wickedly swears to several points (as articles of faith) wherein he himself pretends the Scripture to be wholly silent: but let Whealy deny or own what he pleases 'tis evident to us by the testimonies of all ancient writers, and the following holy Fathers & Doctors that Peter was Bishop of Rome, (viz) St. Irenæus in his 3. book c. 36. Tertullian in his

book de Prescrip. adversus hereticos St. Cyprian in his first book Epist. 3. and in his 4. book Epist. 2. Eusebius in his chronicle of the 44. year S. Epiphanius heresie 27. S. Athanasius in his Epist. to those who lead a solitary life. Dorotheus in his Inventory. Sozomenus in his 4. book c. 4. Optatus in his 1. book against Perminian, S. Ambrose in his book of the Sacraments c. 1. St. Hierome de Viris Illustribus and in his first Epist. to Damas St. Augustin in his 2. book against Petilian c. 51. and in his 165 Epist. Theodoret in his Epist to Leo. Isidorus writing the life of Peter, and all other ancient writers till the year 1400. before which time I desire  
 W healy

Whealy to produce any Author that ever write of Peter's not being Bishop of Rome.

Whealy's second reason for denying this matter. *the office of an Apostle was deriv'd immediately from Christ, and by consequence more honourable and supream than that of Bishop, which was ordain'd by men only. it were therefore no less than madness to think Peter so weake of judgment to quitt the more honourable for the lesser, or the superior for an inferior.* But in this Answer Whealy makes two false suppositions; first he supposes that Peter was ordain'd Bishop by men and not by Christ as Aaron was formerly ordain'd by God chief Priest over the Israelites secondly he supposes that there is

an incompatibility between the office of an Apostle and that of Bishop, which is also false; for tho' they be two dignities, yet they do not tend to incompatible effects; for they both tend to the glory of God propagating the Doctrine of Christ, and establishing the holy Catholick Church, which no man of sence can deny.

As to Whealy's third reason wherein he sayes, *that the commission of an Apostle, goe forth & teach all nations &c. was then more universal than that of Bishoprick &c.* If this wou'd prove any thing against Peters being Bishop, it wou'd also prove that James was not Bishop of Jerusalem, or John Bishop of Ephese, because their commission



tion, was also, to go forth and teach  
all nations &c. which hinder'd  
them not from being Bishops of  
the aforesaid seas as all ancient  
writers do unanimously testifie; as  
to that which he adds saying that  
'tis expressly against the special command  
of Christ to accept of bishoprick at all;  
'tis but some of his presbyterian  
Doctrine, where with he not on-  
ly attakes the Church of Rome;  
but also the present Church of  
Englād: as manifestly appears by  
what he produces in his last ar-  
gument out of Luke c. 22. v 25 &  
26.

His fourth reason against Peter  
being Bishop is, that Peter was A-  
postle of the circumcision and such as  
wrote his Epistles from Babylon not to  
Rome

*Rome* but to the scattered Jewes & Gen-  
 which reason cōtradicts Whealys  
 third Answer, where in he sayes  
 that it was against Christs commād  
 that Peter should accept of bi-  
 shoprick at all, because (as he al-  
 leages) he was oblig'd to go forth  
 and teach all nations; but if Peter  
 was oblig'd to teach all nations,  
 he was not only an Apostle of the  
 circumcision for the word all  
 nations comprēhēds both the Jew-  
 es and Gentiles; by which it ap-  
 pears that Whealy in his owne  
 discourse cōtradicts himself; as for  
 Peters being Apostle only of the  
 circumcision, and Paul only of the  
 Gentiles, 'tis false as is manifest  
 by that of the Acts c. 15. v. 7,  
 where we find the followig words  
when

When there had been much disputing  
Peter rose up and said to them men &  
bretheren ye know that a good while  
ago God made choice among us that  
the Gentiles by my mouth should heare  
the word of the Gospel and believe &c.  
as for that which Whealy adds  
that Peter writ his Epistles from  
Babylon and not to Rome &c. it  
proves his ignorance, and cōfirms  
what he would faine deny: for in  
Peter first Epist c. 5. v: 13. by the  
word Babylon Rome is meant: as  
Papias the Apostles Disciple (ci-  
ted by Eusebius in his 2. book of  
History c. 15. St. Hierome in his  
book de Viris Illustribus in Mar-  
co, Eunomius, Venerable Bede  
and all the Fathers that ever writ  
a commentary on that Epist. do  
unani-

unanimously declare; and it is evident out of the 17. c. of revelations, where John sayes that Babylon was builded on seaven hills and that it's Impire did extend over the Kings of the earth: which not withstandig should fall down and be destroy'd; all which has bee verify'd of the City of Rome and of no other City in the whole world, for it was formerly and is at present builded on seaven hills and it's Impire only did then reach all parts of the world, yet what John fore see came to pass for the Roman Impire was reduc'd almost to nothing, the City wholly run'd, by the Goths, Wandals, Hunns, & Longobards: but what occasion'd people in  
them

them times to call Rome Babylon, was a certain similitude that was between the City of Rome and that of Babylon, when in the time of Nabuchodōsor Babylō was an Imperial City, whose King Nabuchodonosor cruelly persecuted the people of God during their captivity there; evē so in the time of the Apostles Rome was an Imperial City, whose Improor was Nero, who persecuted most cruelly the people of God during his reign it's therefore the City of Rome was call'd another Babylon.

Whealy's fifth reason is grounded on the audiēce given to Paul in the Apostles assembly Acts c. 15. v. 12. by which it seems that Peter till then was wholly a stranger

so the wonders Paul told them he had perform'd among the Gentiles. this consequence is false, for tho' General Ginkle related in a Council of war before the Prince of Orange how he behav'd himself at the breach of Agherim against the Irish, it cannot be infer'd that the Prince of Orange himself was till then wholly a stranger to the Irish affairs, and that he never fought at the breach of the Boyne, or elsewhere against them. & tho' Peter gave audience to Paul telling the Miracles & wonders, which God had wrought among the Gentiles by him and Barnabas; it does not follow that Peter never preach'd the Gospel to any of the Gentiles before that time. as for whealy's

Whealy's 6th. reason that it was after Pauls said relation that the Apostles and Elders sent Barsabas and Silos with him to Antioch to assist in the ministry; I allow that to be true but what Whealy would infer out of it is false; for it does not at all follow out of this, that the Gospel was never preach'd before in any of those Countryes; but what might be lawfully infer'd, is that Barsabas & Silos were not commāded to go with Paul to Antioch, till after the said relation but before this time (beig the 18. year after our Saviours Passiō) the Gospel was preach'd not only in Antioch, but also in Rome by Peter, as I will shew hereafter. as for Whealy's new commentary on the words of our Saviour Mathew

c. 16. v. 18. 19. John c. 21. v. 15. 16 17. I believe no man of sence will prefer it before the exposition of all the holy Fathers and Doctors which is cōtrary to that of Whealy's: as may be seē in my Answer to Mr. Jēnigs 4 poits; as for that word only which our Saviour would have added if he meant Peter in particular as Whealy pretends I would willingly know by what reason can he or any other shew that the word only would be requisite here to prove Peter's supremacy and not in that of John. c. 6. v. 50. where he & the present Church of England do wrest the words of Christ to a figurative sence without the least mētiō of the word only or figuratively; by which it appears how incoher-



ently Whealy argues; and pre-  
tends to expound the words of  
Christ in the said texts, 'its  
apparent that it would be su-  
perfluous for Christ to express  
the word *only* in either of these te-  
xts (viz) Matt c. 16. & John, c. 21 it  
was enough that he spoake to Pe-  
ter personally in the singular num-  
ber, & in these words *Blessed art thou*  
*Simon Barjona for flesh & blood have not*  
*reveal'd it unto thee but my Father who is*  
*in heaven, & I say also unto thee that*  
*thou art Peter & upon this rock I will bu-*  
*ild my Church & the gates of Hell shall*  
*not prevail against it & I will give unto*  
*thee the Keyes of the Kingdom of Hea-*  
*ven & what soever thou shall bind on earth*  
*shall be bound in heaven what so ever thou*  
*shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven*  
Mat. c. 16 v. 17 18. 19 so whe they had died

Jesus said to Simon Peter Simon sonne of Jonas lovest thou me more than these he said unto him yea Lord thou knowest that I love thee, he saith unto him feede my lambes, he saith unto him again the second time Simon sonne of Jonas lovest thou me? he saith unto him yea Lord thou knowest that I love thee, he saith unto him feede my sheepe, he said unto him the third time Simon sonne of Jonas lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, lovest thou me, and he said unto him, Lord thou knowest that I love thee, Jesus said unto him feede my sheep. John c. 21. v. 15. 16 17. which words do plainly prove that our Saviour then meant Peter and none else of the Apostles, for he excluded them by the words Simon Peter sonne of Jonas lovest thou me, which

as the reader may observe our Saviour thrice cōsequently repeated and after Peter answer'd each time, he gave him in charge his lambes and sheepe commanding him to feede them; which he would not have done if he had then meant equally all the rest of the Apostles (as Whealy falsely alleages) but would speake to them Generally in the plural number, as he did in that of Matt. c. 18. v. 19, when he commanded them *to go and teach all nations*; as for that new explication which Whealy gives, saying that our Saviour *spoke particularly to Peter more than to the other Apostles because they were not in the danger that Peter was of swearing cursing & denying his blessed*

blessed Master as Peter after wards did (Matt. c. 26. v. 72.) therefore wanted not the consolation which the Saviour of the world judg'd needfull for the support of a falling Peter and therefore it was he pray'd that his faith should not faile Luke c. 22. v. 31. Whealy expressely contradicts himself in this matter, for in his very last point he flatly denyes that our Saviour committed any particular charge to Peter more than to any other of the Appstles for want of the word only and here he owns that our Saviours words were particularly apply'd to Peter more than to any other of the Apostle which is a manifest contradiction for things signify'd by words must of necessity be apply'd to him to whom

whom the words are apply'd: as Philosophers commonly teach: as for Whealy's explication saying *that it was particularly apply'd to Peter because he was in danger of swearing cursing &c.* tis nonsense, at least if he pretends to be a Christian, for our Saviour spoake these words of John (c. 21.) to Peter after he deny'd him, & after his resurrection: so that there was no danger of Peter's cursing, swearing, and denying Christ the second time, if our Saviour was not to suffer again after his resurrection, which would be an abominable Doctrine to thinke of, that his first Passion & sufferings was not sufficient to redeem all mankind; If it was in order to give Peter some consolation

W

our

our Saviour spoake to him & also pray'd to his heavenly Father that his faith should not faile (according to that of Luke c. 22 v. 31. as Whealy alleages) why did he exclude St. Thomas? who by noe perswasion would believe our Saviours resurrection, untill he saw *the wounds in his hands, and put his finger into the same, and thrust his hand into his side,* John c. 20. v. 25. for really Peters error was of less consequence, than that of Thomas, for he only deny'd that he knew Christ personally, and that out of human fear, for which act he immediately repented and wept betterly; as appears Mat c. 26. v. 75. but we find nothing of Thomas's repentance, tho' he would not believe one of the

the chiefeſt Miſteryes of faith;  
nor do we find in Scripture that  
our Saviour ſpoke ſo favourably  
to him, or pray'd his heavenly Fa-  
ther that his faith ſhould not  
faile; ſo that there muſt needs be  
ſome other thiſg ſiderſtood by the  
ſaid texts, which Whealy ought  
not to deny ſince he cannot ſhew  
ſcripture, Authority, or reaſon  
but impiouſly ſtrives to miſinter-  
pret the plain words of our Savi-  
our, to favour his owne wicked  
deſign. I ſee he paſſes over ſligh-  
tly one of the convincing argu-  
ments that he found in that manuel  
of cōtroverſie, which he pretends  
to confute; and denyes the major,  
minor, and conſequence with-  
out giving any manner of reaſon, on-

ly alleaging that the rest of the Apostles are nam'd before Peter in several places of Scriptures but because he could not poit any of those places he was forc'd to leave the whole argument in it's vigor, and run to another of his owne (as commoly all sectaryes do when they find themselves at a stand) saying that if Christ had invested Peter with any such dominion, either Peter or some of the Evangelists would upon some occasion or other mention'd it: but Peter is no where in scripture said to be invested therefore Peter had no such dominion, as they pretend he had, the major passes yet it may be absolutely deny'd, for all the actions of Christ are not individually mention'd in scripture, as evidently appears by the following



following words of John c. 21, v. 25 there are also many other things, which Jesus did, which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world it self could not contain the bookes that should be written. So that it appears that if the scriptures were silent in this matter (as they are not) that it would not follow that no such thing hath been, as I have shew'd by several other examples before now; the minor also is false: as evidently appears by what I have produc'd out of St. Mathew c. 16. & S. John c. 21, & the consequence cannot be true, for out of false premisses there cannot follow but a false consequence.

As for that frivolous argument

W;

wherewith

with the adversary falsely accuses the Catholicks, alleaging *that they conclude Peter to have been bishop of Rome, because he remov'd his see from Antioch*; let the reader be pleas'd to observe that consequence, to be only some of his calumnies, and not that consequence which the Catholicks do infer, but this which follows: Peter remov'd his see from Antioch to Rome: therefore Peter was bishop of Rome; so that the other is but some of his ill infer'd consequences. As for these two reasons which he alleages, first saying, *that it would be more reasonable to conclude, that in case Peter had been Bishop of Antioch and would from thence remove, that it was to Ierusalem he remov'd, because*  
his

his following calculation proves S. Peter to have been often there. Secondly because he was Apostle of the circumcision I retort his first reason thus.

It were more reasonable to conclude that all shoe-makers would apply themselves in makeing of shoes, thā to impeach themselves in matters of divinity & contravertse: therefore it were more reasonable to cōclude that Whealy, who is a shoe-maker would apply himself in makeing of shoes thā to impeach himself in matters of divinity and controversie, this consequence does not happen: as is manifest by what Whealy publishes in his Almanack; so that it appears, that that which is more reasonable to conclude does not  
always.

alwayes happē; for if it shou'd indeed we would never wrong our neighbours, or commit any sinne against our creator & redeemer; for it would be more reasonable to conclude that we ought to obey his commādmēts, than to become rebels against him, yet we see by daily experience that this happens, & not that which is more reasonable to conclude. As to that removing of Peter, let Whealy know that it was convenient that the chiefest sea of Christianity shoud be fixd, and flourish in that City of Rome, which formerly was the chiefest City & head of Idolatry; & it's the General opiniō of severall holy Fathers, that Peter was commanded by a special revelati-  
on

to fix his sea there; but if in case he had fix'd it in Jerusalem his successours the Bishops of Jerusalem would inherit St. Peter's supremacy, & have the same jurisdiction, that now those of Rome have. as to the adversary's second reason, I say that there was no such compact between Peter & Paul (viz) that one should only preach to the Jewes, & the other to the Gentiles; otherwise Peter would not have declar'd in the assembly that the Apostles & elders had at Jerusalem, *that God made choice among them that the Gentiles by his mouth should heare the word of God & believe* Acts c. 15. v. 7, neither would Paul preach to the Jewes when he came to Rome. Acts c. 18. v. 2, 3 &c.

So that the agreement between them was, that Peter should preach where ever he pleas'd, but principally to the Jewes, and that also Paul wou'd do the same, but principally to the Gentiles. as for Peter's being at Jerusalem several times, it argues not that he remov'd his seat thither, whē he quitted Antioch: as for example Mr. Boyle the Bishop of Down (in Irelād) remov'd his seat from thence, and sat in the three last Parlements in Dublin: shall you therefore infer that it was to Dublin he remov'd his seat? this consequence would not follow; for he remov'd his seat to Clougher, and so might Peter remove his from Antioch to Rome; tho' he was present at these  
assem

assemblies of the Apostles & Elders at Jerusalem. as for Peter's creation, I say that he was created Bishop by Christ, after his Resurrection (even as Aron was instituted high Priest by God over the Israelites) when he gave him in charge the whole Church, as all the proofs which I have produc'd in my Answer to Mr Jennigs 4th. point do plainly make out; & if in case he had been made Bishop by the Apostles it would not prove that he was not their superior: as appears in the case of our Saviour, who was superior to S. John Baptist, and the Jews, yet was Baptis'd by the one, and circumcis'd by the others: as is manifest Luke c. 2. & 3.

now

Now to come to Whealys prepos-  
terous sort of calculation, the rea-  
der will be pleas'd to take notice  
of the followig discourse, where-  
by he may plainly see how S. Pe-  
ter came to be Bishop of Antioch  
and Rome before the 19th. year  
after our Saviour's Passion; he  
stay'd about four years after in  
Judea, he was at Jerusalem behol-  
ding Christ's ascention according  
to that of the Acts c. 1. v. 7 & Paul  
gave him a visit the third year af-  
ter his owne conversion Gala. c.  
1: v. 18. in the begining of the 5th.  
year after our Saviour's Passion,  
Peter went to Siria, and fixt his  
sea in Antioch, where he remain-  
ed seaven years, but did not con-  
tinue in the City all that time  
for



for he went now and then to the adjacent provinces, and preach'd the Gospel there (viz) in Pontus, Asia, Capodocia &c. about the end of the 7th year he return'd to Ierusalem (being 11 years after our Saviour's Passion) and was immediatly imprison'd by Herod Acts. c. 12. v. 4. but was loone larg'd by an Angel: as appears by the 7. 8. & 9. v. of the same chap. the same year, which was the second of the Impire of Claudius: he came to Rome and fix'd his seat there, & preach'd the Gospel to them for the space of seven years, after which time he was expell'd out of the City by Claudius, and so were all the Jewes then in Italy Acts. c. 18. v. 2. after this expulsion

sion (which happen'd in the beginning of the 19th. year after our Lords Passion) Peter went to Jerusalem, & when those of Antioch heard of his coming thither they sent Paul and Barnabas to him in order to decide a controversie risen amōg them about the circumcision, which he did before the whole assembly; as appears Acts. c. 15 v, 10. he could not afterwards return to Rome for the space of four years, by which time Claudius the Improur dy'd; so that the advers party's foolish demonstration is groundless & apparently false, wherein he pretends to prove, that Peter could not be Bishop of Rome during the first 19. years after Christ's Passion, because the scripture makes men-

tion of his being in Ierusalem four several times durig that time, as also his preaching the Gospel in Iudea, Siria &c. But if this had hinder'd Peter's being Bishop of Rome untill that 19th. year Whealy may as well cōclude that the Prince of Orangé was not Crown'd in Englād from the year 1688. untill 1699. because that durig this time he was seen every year in Iresād, Hollād, or Flanders as for his saying that the Second year of Nero's Impire is the 19th. of the years assign'd of Peter's being Bishop of Rome. it's manifestly false; for it is but the 13th. year, for as I have shew'd before, Peter came first to Rome the secōd year of Claudius Impire, who raign'd 13 years, nine mounths & 10, dayes  
fq

so that eleavē years of Claudius  
 Impire with those months and  
 two years of Nero's, do not make  
 up fully 14. years: before  
 which time Paul never came to  
 Rome, as is evident Acts c. 28. v.  
 14. but he write before then his  
 Epist. to the Romans in his Jour-  
 ney to Ierusalem, and in the 16. c.  
 he salutes many of the Romans,  
 and Jewes, who were then Chris-  
 tians, and converted by Peter be-  
 fore he was expell'd by Claudius:  
 where by it appears that Whealy  
 is wholly a strenger not only to  
 ancient Historyes, but also to the  
 very scripture, by which he pre-  
 tends to prove his false Doctrines:  
*as for Paul's two years imprisonment in  
 Rome under Nero, and not making  
 mention*

*mention of Peter in his Epistles to the Colossians, Timothy &c.* It proves not that Peter could not be then in Rome, as for example: it cannot be infer'd that Christ was not circumcise'd, because S. Matthew makes no mention of it; that the star did not appear to the wise-men, because Luke is silent in the matter: that Christ was not born of a Virgin, because Marke makes no mention of it; so that it is to be admir'd, how any man of sense can offer to infer such an illegal consequence: as if St. Paul had been oblig'd to specify all Christians then in Rome, or as if he had positively affirm'd that no Christian had been at Rome that time, but only those

that he names. to explain these texts Colo:c. 4. v. 11. 12. 2. Timoth. c. 4. v. 10. 11. &c. on which Whealy insists; the reader may observe, that Pauls intent, was to give an account of his owne domestick family to these, to whom then he write, who knew them before, which is a most usual thing, for commonly when people write to their well-wishers, they salute them in their acquaintences name, & if they goe from one place to an other, they give them an account of their removeal. so that from first to last Whealy cannot make out that Peter was not Bishop of Rome, from the second year of Claudius reign, till he was crucifi'd in the same city

City (with his head down wards) by Nero the Emprour's orders 25 year after, which Whealy might easily understand (with-out any manner of confusion, or incongruity) out of the following Fathers and ancient writers, (viz) S. Ignatius in his Epist. to the Romans; Eusebius in his 2. book c. 25. Egesippus in his 3. book c. 2. Origenes in his 3, on Geneses St. Athanasius in his Apology de fuga sua. S. Chrysostome in his 32 hom. on S. Paul's Epist. to the Romans. Tertullian in his book de Præscrip. Lactantius in his 4. book Divinarum Institutionum c. 21. St. Ambrose in his Oration against Auxentius. St. Hierome de Viris Illustribus. St. Augustin

in his first book de Consensu Evangelist. c. 10. St. Maximus in his 5. ser de Natali Apostolorum. Sulpitius in his 2 book of History Orosius in his 7th. Eutropius also in his 7th. book writing the life of Nero. Isidorus writing the life of St. Peter. S. Leo in his first ser. de Natali Apostolorum & several other Fathers do testifie the same: by which it manifestly appears that the Papists do agree among themselves about the time that St. Peter came to be Bishop of Rome; for of all the Catholick writers there are only two who do not agree in this point (viz) Marianus Scotus, who sayes that St. Peter came first to Rome in the fourth year of Claudius's



dius's reign, and Onumphrius Panonius, who sayes that he first fix't his sea in Rome before he came to Antioch, and remov'd again from Antioch to Rome

Whealy's last argument. when there was a dispute among the Apostles which of them should be counted greatest (Luke c. 22. v. 24.) our Saviour told them (v. 25. & 26.) the King of the Gentiles exercise Lordship over them. (but sayes he) ye shall not be so, but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger, and he that is chief, as him that doth serve; so that it seems Christ himself deny'd them any such supremacy, and if Christ was in the right, the Church now in communion with the sea of Rome is much in the wrong, to exercise a jurisdiction  
which

*which Christ himself Prohibited*

This argument proves what Whealy would willingly deny; for these words greatelt & chief do plainly shew that there was one chief among the Apostles, whom Christ commanded to be as their minister, not obeying & serving them, as servants doe; but ruling & governing them in humility & Charity, according to that of the Acts c. 10. v. 24. & also to that of St. Pauls first Epist. to the Corinth. c. 11. v. 22. & 23. & this is the same title that the Popes of Rome give themselves in their bulls & patents, for every one of them stiles himself thus: servāto the servants of God; & truely if these words would mean what Whealy

ly

ly pretends to prove they would plainly make-out that it is not only the Church of Rome; but also the present Church of England exercises such a jurisdiction, as he pretends to be prohibited by Christ, for the Church of England allows of primates, Bishops, and several other Ecclesiastical dignitaryes; & perhaps this is what he would faine prove, in order to run them down, and make them all Presbyterians, who do not allow of such dignitaryes, notwithstanding that St. Paul in his Epist to Timothy c. 3 v. 1. recommends the office of a Bishop. as for that which Whealy adds, saying that there was no such thing, as supremacy heard of, till about the year of Christ 196.

'tis but some of his inventions, as  
may be seen in my Answer to  
Mr. Jennings fourth poit, where-  
in I have shew'd that St. Denis  
the Apostles Disciple calls S. Pe-  
ter the Supreme &c. and indeed if  
Whealy will not give better rea-  
sons and grounds, for what he  
promises to prove in his following  
Almanack, than he has given in  
what he pretends to prove in  
this years Almanack, he will  
shew, but his owne ignorāce  
& presumption as he has  
done in what he write  
this year

FINIS

# INDEX

**M**asses were said in the first five  
ages after Christ's birth p. 20.

The communion was given under one  
kind to the laity in the first five  
ages. p. 38

Common prayers were said in a lan-  
guage not vulgarly understood by all  
the hearers in the first five ages p. 55

The Pope of Rome's supremacy was  
acknowledg'd in the first five  
ages, p. 68.

The real presence was believ'd in the  
first five ages p. 98.

The holy Eucharist was ador'd in the  
first five ages p. 129.

Transubstantiation was believ'd in the  
first five ages p. 133.

Images has been venerated in the  
first five ages p. 142.

Saints were pray'd too, in the first  
five

five ages

p. 164.

Purgatory was believ'd in the first  
five ages

p. 188.

All those of the first five ages had not  
the word of God in their maternal  
Language

p. 224.

The reformers Doctrines are but a  
heap of old heresies lawfully condem-  
n'd in the first five ages

p. 243

An Answer to what V bealy alleg-  
es against St. Peters Supremacy p. 1.  
at the later end

P

r. c

p. 3

r. Q

p. 86

8. r

4. r.

l. 5.

79.

7. r.

176.

78.

2. r.

p. 23

ome

happ

court

esir

is po

# Errata.

**P**Age. 8. l. 13. r. prayers p. 13.  
 l. 13. r. peaceable. p. 16 l. 11.  
 r. espous'd p. 30, l. 13 r. 64.  
 p. 39. l. 12. r. Luké. p. 66. l. 5.  
 r. Queen. p. 85. l. 8. r. saves.  
 p. 86. l. 16. r. relieve. p. 109 l.  
 8. r. Num. l. 17. r, life p. 110. l.  
 4. r. the p. 118. l. 10. 151. l. 9. 171.  
 l. 5. 173. l. 20. 174. l. 6. 175. l. 15.  
 79. l. 12. 190. l. 16. 191 l. 4. & 109. l.  
 7. r. does p. 148. l. 3 r. things p.  
 176. l. 18. r. a before prejudice p.  
 178. l. 14. r. soldiers p. 220. l.  
 1. r. were p. 232. l. 4. r. catechesed  
 p. 237. l. 13. r. ruine. these with  
 some other oversights which  
 happen'd in the correction, the  
 courteous reader is most humbly  
 desir'd charitably to mend with  
 his penn.